

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 31, 1976:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Everett T. Keech, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice Francis Hughes, resigned.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The following-named persons to the positions indicated:

Margareta E. White, of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Communications

Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1971, vice Charlotte T. Reid, resigned.

Joseph R. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1976, vice Glen O. Robinson, term expired.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate August 31, 1976:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Margareta E. White, of Virginia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1976, vice Glen O. Robinson, term expired, which was sent to the Senate on July 19, 1976.

Joseph R. Fogarty, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1971, vice Charlotte T. Reid, resigned, which was sent to the Senate on July 21, 1976.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A GREAT AMERICAN

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as we are celebrating 200 years of American freedom, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this House the story of one brave American who, during the struggle for our freedom two centuries ago, made an outstanding and honorable contribution to that great cause—Richard Stanup (Stanhope), a black American, who was born at Fredericksburg, Va., March 1, 1748, and died at the age of 114 years September 20, 1862. For more than 50 years he was a resident of Champaign County, Ohio.

Mr. Melwood Stanhope, who is the great, great grandson of Richard Stanup, still resides in Champaign County at Urbana, which is also my home. Mr. Stanhope is as proud of his country today as was his great, great grandfather before him. With the following words, Mr. Stanhope stated his pride in America and his hopes for our future in a recent letter to President Ford:

JANUARY 12, 1976.

PRESIDENT FORD,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On July 4th we will celebrate the 200th anniversary of the founding of our Country, paying tribute to those who fought, bled and died for its independence. My Great, Great Grandfather, Richard Stanup, a name given by General Washington which was later changed to Stanhope according to Ballous Dollar Magazine of 1859. He is one American whose role has never been recognized.

Richard Stanup (Stanhope) was said to have been according to History, Chief of Servants and Body Guard of General Washington. He fought with him during the Revolutionary War. Being wounded several times and was at the bed of the First President when he died. For his service, he was given his freedom and a land grant of 400 acres in the territory of Ohio. The daughters of the American Revolution, a few years ago, placed a Plaque on his grave, which was greatly appreciated by the family being unable to join the organization because we were Black and my Great Great Grandfather was a slave.

We still reside in Urbana, Champaign County, Ohio and have not allowed his achievements to be forgotten. Taking pride in his role as a Patriot and a Citizen in America's founding, I am just as proud of my Country as was my Great Great Grandfather. We, as Citizens, are fortunate and blessed with the opportunity to live under and with one of the finest systems of Government ever

developed in the History of the civilized world. It must be protected at any cost. The American people may be forced against their will to lose respect for and confidence in a President, but they must never never lose respect for and confidence in the office of the President. What I am hoping for Mr. President, is a leadership at this point in time, to call America and the world to obey God and build a moral and ethnic world for the United States and elsewhere that will stand on a foundation as solid as our forefathers built in the beginning of the Republic which gave us direction for the first 200 years of our existence. Let us call upon all America, Black and White together, to heed God's call to provide leadership that will guide us through the coming years so that America will be as strong 200 years from now as we are today.

Sincerely,

MELWOOD STANHOPE.

FTC SEEKS TO DESTROY BIG BUSINESS

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, one of the major concerns of the people throughout this Nation is the increasing involvement of the Federal Government in every aspect of our economic and personal lives. The increasing Federal interference makes it more and more difficult for our free enterprise system to plan effectively or to work efficiently. As the Government becomes more and more involved, it becomes harder and harder for American business to take new risks, to initiate new products and to create new jobs.

Mr. William E. LaMothe, president of the Kellogg Co., in a recent article in the New York Times, expressed the concern which is felt by thousands of businessmen throughout the Nation—and not just those who work for major corporations, either; but hundreds and thousands of small businessmen as well. While the specific problem which Mr. LaMothe discusses in his article is that of the big business, it is typical of the Government intervention in every sector of the economy, with Federal regulatory agencies "making laws" far beyond the express intention of the Congress when the laws were created.

I commend Mr. LaMothe's thoughtful article to you. It is well for all of us to remember that it is private enterprise which creates jobs and economic growth, not the Government. It should be the

Government which passes the laws, not the regulatory commissions. I include Mr. LaMothe's article from the Sunday, August 8, New York Times at this point in the RECORD:

FTC SEEKS TO DESTROY BIG BUSINESS

(By William E. LaMothe)

(NOTE.—In recent days the motives of the staffs of two Government regulatory agencies have been severely criticized. In a statement printed below, William E. LaMothe, president of the Kellogg Company, attacked the Federal Trade Commission's new "shared monopoly" theory under which it is attempting to break up concentration in the breakfast cereal business.

(In another case, David I. Kraushaar, an administrative law judge of the Federal Communications Commission, ruled last week that the long distance rates of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company were reasonable and disagreed with an F.C.C. trial staff proposal on splitting A.T.&T.'s manufacturing arm, the Western Electric Company from its parent.

(By coincidence, the Federal Trade Commission also announced last week that it would begin a major antitrust investigation of the automobile industry. It is believed that the investigation is aimed, in part at least, at General Motors Corporation, largest of the four American car makers.)

There is a lack of trust, a bias, a negative feeling in our Government. It's an antitrust attitude that has pervaded our Federal regulatory agencies and appears to have started them on a binge of negativism and destruction. It's a "we-don't-trust-you" notion that can lead to the same abuse of power and injustice, the same excesses manifested in Watergate.

Today, one of those mistrustful agencies, the Federal Trade Commission, is quietly launching one of the broadest, most massive and most expensive attacks by Government on corporations ever undertaken in America. And it's all rooted in mistrust, a blatant blinding mistrust of America's most outstanding resource—the efficient and successful business enterprise.

Evidence that government is stepping up its attack on American business is everywhere. In his 1974 economic message, President Ford asked for fines of \$1 million for antitrust violations. In 1975 the Supreme Court slapped a \$1,000-a-day fine on a corporation that is estimated to run into millions. Budgets have risen sharply for the antitrust activities of the Justice Department and F.T.C. Every day we read of some new effort by the F.T.C. to pull out of corporate America a corpus delicti, the evidence that a crime has been committed. What crime? What charges? Are the Commission's efforts preceded by evidence of something awful? No. Are these expeditions for evidence founded on anything more than presumptions of guilt? No. Take the recent demand the F.T.C. made of the advertising industry. The commission subpoenaed eight major ad agencies to submit a mountain of materials, everything they've produced since last May.

Was there a charge of some wrongdoing? No. Conspiracy? No. It was simply a case of "give me the evidence so I can indict you for anything you might have done that I'll find out about," with the potential defendant's help, of course.

Take the case of the F.T.C.'s recently ordering six tobacco companies to supply it all the market research the companies conducted during the past 12 years. Whether you smoke or don't smoke, you might wonder if the F.T.C. is empowered by Congress to cut cigarette sales. It isn't.

And now take the unprecedented case against my industry, the cereal industry, the F.T.C.'s most ambitious project by far. The F.T.C. accuses the major manufacturers of breakfast cereals of being what the commission terms, a "shared monopoly." It seeks to break us up, strip away our plants, force us to give the exclusive right to make some of our most successful products, Rice Krispies and Special K. Furthermore, we would have to license the formula and trademark for every Kellogg cereal to anyone who wants to use them free of charge. And what did we do to be standing in the shadow of this guillotine? What are we accused of doing wrong? Nothing. We're not being accused of doing anything, but of *being* something. That's right. They're accusing us of being a shared monopoly which is their novel theory that a handful of companies can control a market even though there is no overt conspiracy.

The cereal industry is not charged with committing a single specific illegal act, but has been hauled into court because only four companies sell most of the cereal in this country. The F.T.C. claims that's too concentrated. Concentrated. That's another term they use. They claim that our "concentration ratio" is too high.

What's a concentration ratio?

It's a figure, a percentage, that shows what fraction of an entire industry's production and sales is attained by a limited number of companies. In other words, if 80 percent of the business of an industry is done by four companies only, the four firm concentration ratio for that industry is 80 percent. They say ours is 90 percent. That's very interesting because it shows that our industry is acting like most of the mature industries in America. According to the latest Bureau of the Census report, the four firm concentration ratio of industries from light bulbs to baking powder is way up there. The window glass industry, for example, is 100 percent concentrated; household washers and dryers 83 percent; chewing gum 84 percent; baking powder 89 percent; automobiles 93 percent; electric light bulbs 90 percent; television sets 95 percent; outboard motors 85 percent. And I can go on and on. Have these other industries been charged with anything? No. The F.T.C. first has to win its test case—and that's against us, the cereal industry. What happens if it wins? If the F.T.C. can convince the courts of the validity of its shared monopoly theory, it can declare over half of all the industries in America—producing over two-thirds of our manufactured products—guilty and break all of them, and along with it the free market system.

What is also foreboding and ominous about this is that a regulatory agency of the executive branch is using the cereal case to pioneer antitrust legislation that Congress hasn't even passed. The Government is attacking concentration per se as they see it and a regulatory commission is attempting to legislate an entirely new offense, this thing called a shared monopoly. There is no statute, no legal literature, not one adjudicated case, based on such an offense. In essence, there is no offense, but the F.T.C., with its enormous power and enormous budget and its enormous staff, is usurping the legislative powers of Congress. It is preempting Congress, preempting the laws of this land and interpreting laws to suit un-American

objectives. This is precisely what got the Nixon Administration into trouble. And it's all related to mistrust, a mistrust of America's corporate talent and ingenuity that has provided you and me with the best products in the world, with jobs, with a future. A mistrust of skillful management and marketing techniques that are emulated throughout the world, mistrust of what sadly is becoming a great embarrassment in America, the embarrassment of success, a quality that seems to irritate a big bungling bureaucracy.

Why the cereal industry? Why were we singled out? It is documented that one of the primary reasons the cereal industry was singled out for this unprecedented case was because it was presumed we lacked political clout. That's right. We were literally picked because we were thought to be politically weak. Well, we're working on our clout and that's why I'm asking you this question: What happens if our industry is splintered, broken up because it is found guilty, guilty of success, guilty of making wholesome products, guilty of providing one of the best nutritional buys in America, guilty of succeeding in a system that has up till now rewarded success, not punished it, guilty of working and achieving within a system that has provided the incentive for us to grow and develop and become the greatest country on earth. Success. We're not ashamed of it. We're not embarrassed by it. We don't feel guilty over it. And we don't think it's a crime. And neither should you. Neither should America.

Now, there's a fiction, a fantasy, a simple-mindedness growing in this land of ours that somehow breaking up the nation's large corporations will result in lower prices, that somehow this would be good for the consumer, that fractionating corporate America, compelling its leading corporations toward a costly, wasteful, time-consuming and contentious breakup is going to benefit consumers. Nothing can be further from reality, or from the truth.

It is no wonder that divestiture supporters rarely make outright promises of lower prices. They know if it happened at all, it would be only temporary.

Believe me, it just isn't realistic to think that the Government can fractionalize companies like the Big Three automakers into 10 or 20 car makers. Apart from the problem of producing a car that is going to run at all, the cost of producing a car in small manufacturing units would be astronomical. Since the days of Henry Ford, we've learned that mass production lowers the price per item. When production lags and overhead stays the same, the price per item must rise to cover that overhead. Even today, with the cost of materials, labor and energy going up year after year, we have quite a job trying to keep the price of a box of cereal in some relation to what's left in the average pay envelop. If the F.T.C. forces us to give up the economies of big scale production, distribution and marketing, the price of all of those products has to go up. And that's certainly what would happen if they broke up the cereal industry.

I don't really believe that will happen. American common sense is too well developed to allow the takeover of an industry by the Government under the name of "fostering free enterprise." But if we have to, we'll fight all the way to the Supreme Court to keep that from happening to the cereal industry. With companies like Kellogg's, General Mills, General Foods, Quaker Oats, Ralston, Nabisco and Pet in a single industry, there's got to be competition, and there is, every single morning all over America. Don't let anyone force on you the notion that just because there are only a few companies in an industry that they're not competitive. That is another myth that should be kicked out into the open.

Today there's a general feeling that we've got too much government. I think the time

is right, the time is now to impress upon representatives, to impress upon the Government just what its role should be. I believe this role should be built on trust—a fundamental trust of a system that has served this country so well for 200 years, a system not perfect, not without excesses, but one that allows you and me and our families to come pretty close to living the good life.

(NOTE.—William E. LaMothe is president of the Kellogg Company, and these remarks are excerpted from a recent speech given at 144th Annual Convention of the International Platform Association in Washington, D.C.)

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1074

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my fellow colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON) in cosponsoring House Joint Resolution 1074, a resolution calling for a study of the marketing and misuse of infant formula in developing nations. The substitution of infant formula for mothers' milk under uneconomic and unhygienic conditions represents a serious threat to infant nutrition in many of these countries.

In a statement released in late 1973 by the United Nations' protein advisory group, pediatricians, and food industry executives agreed that—

Infants of more affluent socioeconomic groups in industrialized and developing countries, in the absence of breast feeding, suffer no nutritional disadvantage when fed properly constituted and hygienically prepared processed commercial formulas . . .

The advisory group recognized:

However, the early abandonment of breast feeding by mothers among lower socioeconomic groups can be disastrous to infants, particularly when this occurs without adequate financial resources to purchase sufficient formula and without knowledge of and facilities to follow hygienic practices necessary to feed infants adequately and safely with breast milk replacements.

When breast feeding was widespread among the poor, malnutrition usually did not become severe until the second year of a child's life. But the decline of breast feeding over the past two decades has caused the average age of children suffering from severe forms of malnutrition to drop from 18 to 8 months in some parts of the world.

Even if the mother herself is malnourished, breast feeding will probably provide a child with adequate nourishment for the first 4 to 6 months of life. Bottle feeding under the same conditions may well result in providing the child with overdiluted, contaminated formula in bacteria-laden bottles.

Mr. Speaker, because of my concern for the poor of the world, I have cosponsored this resolution calling for the President to conduct a study of the infant formula problem through the appropriate Executive branch channels, and calling on the Agency for International Development to promote breast feeding in its programs around the world.

For the vulnerable infant and young child, a reversal of the present trend away from breast feeding could be of

greater significance than any other form of early childhood nutrition program. For that reason, I am pleased to cosponsor House Joint Resolution 1074, and urge my colleagues to cosponsor and work for its adoption.

BONNEVILLE TRICENTENNIAL

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I proudly submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following resolution brought to my attention by Capt. Thomas J. Wadsworth of Idaho Falls, Idaho.

As executive director of the Bonneville County Bicentennial Commission, Captain Wadsworth and his fellow members have established the first Tricentennial Commission in America.

Captain Wadsworth's enduring image as a patriot is again to be commended:

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BONNEVILLE TRICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Whereas, the Bonneville Bicentennial Commission was formed May 1, 1973, by resolution of the Board of Bonneville County Commissioners and area mayors and the city-country area was named the first Bicentennial Community in Northwest America (Alaska, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana), and

Whereas, the Commission has been among the most active in America in promoting love of Country and the fact that the United States is not just territory, that it is a way of life and a state of mind, inculcated with those unalienable and divine rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and

Whereas, the Commission has derived its strength from the areas young and old people alike, represented the wide spectrum of community groups and activities, spearheaded countless patriotic activities and programs dedicated to love of Flag and Country, and made it known July 4th, 1976, was directly and exclusively the 200th birthday of the most important, God inspired proclamation of religious and political principles ever declared to be the foundation of a new Nation, and

Whereas, on the morning of America's third century there is a continuing need to reaffirm and pledge ourselves to activities that will unite the nation in purpose and dedication and advance human welfare and dignity, and

Whereas, the continuing goal of the Commission is to inculcate present area citizens and those of generations to come with a sense of the greatness of America and to imbue in their hearts and minds determination to never surrender the sacred rights of individuals set forth in the Declaration of Independence and guaranteed in the U.S. Constitution and the original Bill of Rights.

Now therefore be it resolved by the members that the Bonneville Bicentennial Commission on this 29th day of July 1976 that the Commission with the approval of the Board of County Commissioners and Mayors of our communities shall continue its programs as the Bonneville Tricentennial Commission, meeting and working as in the past to forge a new Spirit of '76.

FEDERAL RESERVE DIRECTORS: A STUDY OF CORPORATE AND BANKING INFLUENCE

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in mid-August a report entitled "Federal Reserve Directors: A Study of Corporate and Banking Influence" was released by the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing with publicity to highlight the report's questionable conclusions. Although it is noted on the cover in small print that "The report has not been officially adopted by the committee * * * and may not necessarily reflect the views of its members" that does not tell half the story. Not only had the committee not adopted it, so far as I know no member of the committee with the possible exception of a couple of members of the majority even knew it was being prepared until it was publicly released.

Furthermore, the committee staff, unlike the General Accounting Office, did not even afford the agency an opportunity to review and comment. As you know most GAO reports are submitted to the agency involved before they issue their reports and agency comments or disagreements are usually included in the GAO report to give readers a balanced outlook on the issues.

As the Federal Reserve was not accorded this courtesy, Chairman Burns took it upon himself to write Chairman Reuss expressing the Board's reactions to the report. As I believe the public deserves the opportunity to share these views I include a copy of that letter at this point in the RECORD:

AUGUST 26, 1976.

HON. HENRY S. REUSS,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Currency
and Housing, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN REUSS: I am writing with reference to the release of a report by your Committee staff entitled "Federal Reserve Directors: A Study of Corporate and Banking Influence."

The conclusion of the report that the Federal Reserve is controlled by corporate and banking groups has no foundation in fact. The technique used by your staff to arrive at this strange conclusion could just as logically have been used to demonstrate that universities and colleges, or hospitals for that matter, have a dominant influence on Federal Reserve operations, since many of our directors are also trustees of universities, serve on the boards of hospitals, and are otherwise active in community work.

As far as business and banking are concerned, the Federal Reserve Act requires that three of the nine directors at each head office represent banks (that is, lenders) and that another three represent commercial, industrial and agricultural interests (that is, borrowers). Inasmuch as large and medium-sized businesses are the largest users of credit, it is only natural that executives from these business entities should be represented on our district Boards. Here, as in numerous other places in the staff report, a

wrong conclusion is suggested: that the presence of these executives on Federal Reserve Bank Boards somehow works to the disadvantage of the public at large. The fact, of course, is that the business directors have a vital interest in a sound and growing economy, an interest shared by all business borrowers and households.

As for the three public directors, the Federal Reserve Act directs that both the Chairman and Deputy Chairman of each head office Board be selected from among these public directors. This provision limits the Board's ability to select candidates from a broad segment of the population since both the Chairman and Deputy Chairman must have executive abilities. Legislation already passed by the House to increase the number of public directors from three to six would help the Board in selecting a more broadly based category of directors at each head office. As you know, the Board favored this provision of the House bill. In fact, the Board had suggested an even larger proportionate representation by public directors.

It is well to keep in mind that many of our Bank directors are highly experienced managers, and that they put their managerial knowledge and skills at the Federal Reserve System's disposal. The benefits are reflected in the sharp improvement of productivity in conducting System operations. The measurable output of the Federal Reserve Banks has approximately doubled in the past eight years with only a 40 per cent increase in System personnel. In fact, the total number of individuals employed by the System will be a little lower in 1976 than it was in 1974, despite a large increase in the volume of Federal Reserve Bank operations. A great deal of credit for this must be given to the management advice provided by our directors.

In conclusion, let me repeat a statement that I made before your Committee on April 9 regarding the question of control:

"The control of the Federal Reserve resides firmly with the Board of Governors. The Federal Reserve Act empowers the Board to exercise supervision over the Federal Reserve Banks and to suspend or remove any officer or director of a Reserve Bank. The Board has exclusive responsibility for changes in reserve requirements, margin requirements, and banking regulations. True, changes in the discount rate originate at the Reserve Banks; but they require explicit approval by the Board of Governors, and we examine every discount rate proposal with utmost care. Open market decisions are made by the Federal Open Market Committee (FOMC), which consists—as you know—of the seven members of the Board and five Reserve Bank presidents. This structure of the FOMC avoids complete centralization of monetary policy decisions in Washington, but the Board Members are plainly in the majority on that body and the Chairman of the Board serves also as Chairman of the FOMC. Thus, responsibility for decision-making rests preponderantly with the seven members of the Board of Governors."

With kind regards,
Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR F. BURNS.

ASIA FOUNDATION SHIPS MILLIONTH BOOK

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 20 years the Asia Foundation in

San Francisco has conducted a program of assistance to Asian nations in behalf of the United States and U.S. ideas of freedom and democracy.

This year in celebration of our Nation's Bicentennial the foundation set a goal of 1 million books to be shipped to Asian nations. The foundation has already surpassed these goals. This foundation is sponsored from private, corporate contributions, and is an excellent example of our free enterprise system working to keep the world informed about our own country. The foundation should be commended for its efforts. The following letter and news release gives more details about this program:

MENTERI PENERANGAN DAN
TUGAS-TUGAS KHAS,
Malaysia, August 13, 1976.

HON. MR. HENRY KISSINGER,
U.S. Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Shortly after my arrival in San Francisco to attend the International Harvard Seminar Alumni Meeting, I was accorded the privilege of taking part in a ceremony marking the one-millionth book to be donated to Asia under the Books for Asia programme for 1976.

Since the millionth book was to be presented to Malaysia and since it was coincidentally to represent the one-millionth book for Malaysia since the inception of the Book for Asia programme in 1954, I was pleased to accept a copy of the New American Heritage Dictionary as a symbol of this double event. I understand that the Asia Foundation has shipped more than 15 million books and journals over the past 22 years. This is a most remarkable achievement for which we in Asia are profoundly thankful.

While going through the ceremony of receiving the book from Dr. Williams of the Asia Foundation, I could not help associating it with the topic of the Seminar "The Meaning of Independence". The reason lies in the important role that books can play in extending the horizon of one's experience and thereby emancipating one's way of thinking. The transmission of knowledge through Book Programmes like the one administered by the Asia Foundation has no doubt the impact of strengthening one's attitude of Independence, and enabling one to play a more meaningful role in maintaining Independence. The Books for Asia programme has contributed in this process of knowledge transmission to countless millions of the people of Asia.

I warmly commend to your attention this excellent programme, which is supported by generous donations of books and journals from publishers, universities, libraries and other sources. I for my part will certainly carry back to Malaysia an increased awareness of what Books for Asia is doing.

I was hoping that I could give you a call when I visit Washington on the 19th and 20th, August. However, since it is understandably difficult to arrange a mutually convenient date for us, let us hope there will be an occasion in the future when we can meet again.

ABDUL-TAIB.

ASIA FOUNDATION SHIPS MILLIONTH BOOK
SAN FRANCISCO, August 17.—The Asia Foundation has met its goal to help celebrate the U.S. Bicentennial by sending one million books overseas this year.

The occasion was marked amid thousands of books in the Foundation's 6,000 square-foot warehouse on Sixth Street when President Haydn Williams presented Malaysian

Minister of Information Datuk Taib with the one-millionth book to be shipped to Asia this year.

After stating that under the Foundation's Books for Asia program, 15 million books and journals have been distributed to 19 Asian countries over the last 23 years, Dr. Williams explained:

"It is not so much that this is a unique record of service from one people to another as it is a communication of a whole body of knowledge from one people to another," he said. "Today thousands of institutions in Asia and many people have shared in this communication."

The year's millionth book—a dictionary—also is the millionth book being shipped to Malaysia since the program began in 1954.

Minister Taib, in accepting the book, noted, "The man who can read, and who has books to read, is a man who has independence, whatever the political realities of the land in which he lives. Independence from ignorance, from poverty, from apathy: all of this can be gained from the knowledge stored between the pages of a book."

"Books for Asia has brought this opportunity to countless millions of people who might otherwise never have had it," the Malaysian minister added.

More than 150,000 books and journals are shelved at the warehouse at any one given time. They are donated by American publishers, book stores, libraries, school systems, professional societies, and individuals.

The Foundation's representatives in 12 offices in Asia keep the San Francisco staff informed of each community's needs and books are shipped as requested for use by students, scholars, businessmen, people in the professions, government administrators, civic leaders and the general public.

Requests always outnumber shipments, according to Books for Asia director Carlton Lowenberg.

The Asia Foundation is a nonprofit organization established in 1954 that assists 13 Asian countries from Japan to Afghanistan through grants of seed money for social and economic development. Areas of concentration are education; law and public administration; communications; management, manpower and economic development; population, food and nutrition; urban and rural affairs, and Asian regional exchange.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—To date in 1976, The Asia Foundation has shipped a total of 1,057,959 books and journals overseas. The breakdown is as follows: Afghanistan, 9,387; Bangladesh, 107,039; Indonesia, 45,832; Japan, 163,545; Korea, 25,791; Malaysia, 83,949; Nepal, 2,243; Pakistan, 80,826; Philippines, 403,106; Singapore, 98,852; Taiwan, Republic of China, 15,865, and Thailand, 21,424.

RED CROSS CERTIFICATE OF MERIT AWARDED

HON. MARK W. HANNAFORD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. HANNAFORD. Mr. Speaker, Messrs. Robert Agaloff of Lakewood, Calif., and Malcolm Smallwood of Huntington Beach, Calif., have been awarded the Red Cross Certificate of Merit. This is the highest award given by the American National Red Cross to a person who saves or sustains a life by using skills and knowledge learned in a volunteer train-

ing program offered by the Red Cross in first aid, small craft, or water safety.

On May 26, 1976, Messrs. Agaloff and Smallwood, along with coworker Al Smith, succeeded in reviving a heart attack victim who had suddenly collapsed while working nearby in the hold of a ship. Mr. Smith, who reached the victim first, began to administer mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. After several minutes, Mr. Agaloff arrived and took over for the tiring Mr. Smallwood. The two continued for several minutes until paramedics could safely transport the victim to a hospital. The faultless teamwork and quick action demonstrated by these three men undoubtedly saved the victim's life.

It is, indeed, an honor to bring to the attention of my colleagues the valorous deeds of Messrs. Agaloff, Smallwood, and Smith. Their compassion and quick action demonstrate the highest level of service for a fellow human being in time of need. This high regard for human life will make our communities safer and more fulfilling places for all of us to live in. It is with extreme pride and gratitude that I congratulate Messrs. Agaloff, Smallwood, and Smith. In so doing, I am sure that I express the thanks of all the people of the 34th Congressional District.

THE UNITED NATIONS' WORLD OF "NEWSPEAK"

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the penchant of the United Nations for imposing false double standards is continuing.

The targets of the wrath of this world body are not the major oppressors of the world but, quite to the contrary, those countries which, despite their problems, have elected governments and rule by law.

The result is that Israel is regularly condemned, while the U.N. refuses to take a stand against terrorism. South Africa is repeatedly criticized, although not a word is said about the genocidal policies of such black African states as Uganda. Taiwan is expelled, and the totalitarian Communist Chinese regime is seated. A boycott is imposed upon Rhodesia, while trade with the Soviet Union and other truly totalitarian states is encouraged.

Recently, a meeting was held of the U.N.'s Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

One session of this meeting dealt with both Canada and the Soviet Union. The culprit, according to the strange standards of the U.N., was, of course, Canada.

When it came time to discuss the Soviet Union, the delegates had only praise. As the Wall Street Journal recently pointed out, there was not "a word about treatment of Jews, Crimean Tatars or Central Asian Muslims. The 'expert'

from Ecuador noted that 'since no discriminatory legislation had existed in the Soviet Union, no internal modifications had been necessary.'

The Journal, in an editorial entitled "The World of Newspeak" in its issue of August 30, 1976, points out:

This particular committee is no freak, either. . . . The United Nations does not share out esteem for civil and political liberty, and we should keep our distance from its distorted pronouncements on that subject.

It is high time that the Congress carefully review proposals which I and others have made concerning the need to sharply limit our contribution to the United Nations. The world body, unfortunately, is guilty of fostering the racism, persecution, and discrimination which it decries. American taxpayers should remove themselves from the position of paying for this betrayal of our values.

I wish to share with my colleagues the editorial, "The World of Newspeak," as it appeared in the Wall Street Journal of August 30, 1976, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

THE WORLD OF NEWSPEAK

Newspeak now so permeates all the operations of the United Nations that anyone with a healthy respect for human liberty should approach that body's causes with deep suspicion, no matter how worthy they sound. UN commissions ostensibly formed to combat discrimination or advance human rights and the status of women have become snares for the naive and unwary. Anyone involving himself in their activities is liable to find himself advancing anti-Semitism, the most virulent form of discrimination in the 20th Century, and attacking the institutions of liberal democracy, like freedom of speech and the press.

Consider, for instance, the meeting of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination earlier this month. This group was discussing reports from various countries on their steps to implement the "International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination." One session dealt with both Canada and the Soviet Union, and the country which received the harshest criticism was, naturally, Canada.

Jose D. Ingles, "expert" from the Philippines, complained that Canada refused to punish "all incitement to racial hatred," as required by article four of the convention. Canadian law, he charged, only covered incitement leading to a breach of the peace, and didn't provide penalties "if the promotion of such hatred took place in private conversations." Igor Blisshenko of the Soviet Union accused Canada of failing to comply because it only prohibited racist activity, and wouldn't suppress "racist organizations" outright. (The delegates didn't spell it out, but since the UN declared last year that Zionism was another form of racism, the organizations to be suppressed would logically include any group giving support to Israel.)

When it came to the Soviet Union's report, however, delegates were all praise, without a word about treatment of Jews, Crimean Tatars or Central Asian Muslims. The "expert" from Ecuador noted "that since no discriminatory legislation had existed in the Soviet Union, no internal modifications had been necessary to ratify the convention." Other speakers praised its fight against apartheid in South Africa. The Bulgarian representative "was happy to note the 'multisided and different types of demonstrations of solidarity' with people struggling against all forms of racial discrimination, as evidenced by the Soviet Union's enumeration of the ob-

servance of certain days and other celebrations in that field."

This particular committee is no freak, either. The UN has promoted more than 20 "human rights" treaties, and most of them have some features repugnant to our constitutional tradition. The Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, an all-encompassing statement which entered into force this year, includes a section guaranteeing freedom of expression, but then it makes exceptions on grounds of national security and public order that render the whole thing meaningless. The document is so pitched to the lowest common denominator that for us to accept it as definitive would betray our commitment to liberty.

Although this UN newspeak reached its most blatant form in last year's General Assembly resolution on Zionism, the problem long predates the emergence of the Third World blocs. In fact, we think it comes from the very idea of the United Nations itself, in the attempt to bring the liberal West and the Communist world into the same framework on anything beyond most simple principles of international relations. As everyone must realize by now, the West and the Communist bloc have radically different theories on the meaning of personal liberty and the obligations of a government toward its citizens. These theories can't be amalgamated without distorting one or the other, and the Communists have done much better than the West in imposing their viewpoint on these international conventions.

Fortunately, the U.S. Senate has done the next best thing, and simply shunned them. Even though the U.S. signed the convention on eliminating racism, we were spared the embarrassment of Canada because the State Department never sent this document, or most of the others, to the Senate for ratification. The diplomats knew it would never be approved, and now perhaps they understand why. The UN does not share our esteem for civil and political liberty, and we should keep our distance from its distorted pronouncements on that subject.

DOCUMENTATION OF OUTRAGES AGAINST AMERICANS IN MEXICO

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, since we have begun commenting upon deteriorating conditions in Mexico, we have received a large amount of information privately, some of which is quite alarming. Some of it bears upon a situation just recently described in the Wall Street Journal on August 30, detailing the hostile treatment, to put it mildly, received by a number of respectable Americans, not involved with drugs. The Journal article is worth presentation, as follows:

TRAVELERS' PERIL—MORE U.S. TOURISTS FIND TRIP TO MEXICO LANDS THEM IN JAIL—AMERICAN VISITORS CHARGE QUESTIONABLE ARRESTS, LACK OF U.S. ASSISTANCE—"IT COST ME EVERYTHING"

(By Kenneth G. Slocum)

Donald Postles went to Mexico to hunt doves. Joseph F. Sabo accompanied his friend Robert Wantland on a business trip. Alan Glickson and Marnin Steinberg crossed the border to buy handcrafted items.

All five men got tripped up by the often perverse and usually obscure Mexican system

of justice. They were jailed and ignored; they finally paid dearly in order to obtain their legal release from Mexican prisons. Their separate but similar experiences seem to be best summed up by one lesson: A trip to Mexico may be hazardous to your health—and to your freedom.

That grim message is being voiced increasingly by middle-class tourists. Congressmen and businessmen as what had been a wrangle mainly over drug-related arrests escalates into a high-level confrontation that threatens to strain diplomatic relations between the U.S. and Mexico. The dispute centers around questionable arrests and alleged extortion and torture of Americans in a country that once offered obstacles to tourists no greater than Montezuma's Revenge.

Rep. Fortney H. Stark Jr. (D., Calif.) says that the U.S. should consider a tourist boycott of Mexico. "While perhaps every American going to Mexico may not be subject to the cattle prod, the stories coming from the prisons are true," he adds. "It can indeed be dangerous to travel to Mexico even if you're a simple and innocent tourist. The Good Neighbor policy is dead."

PRISONER EXCHANGE POSSIBLE

In June, Congress amended the International Security Assistance Act to require President Ford to communicate directly with the Mexican government about the issue of human and legal rights of Americans arrested there. The President is required to provide a progress report every four months. For its part, Mexico has proposed a possible exchange of American prisoners for Mexican nationals serving time in U.S. jails.

Today, some 600 Americans are in Mexican prisons. That figure has tripled in the last three years and now represents 20% of Americans held in all foreign jails. About 75% of the inmates in Mexico are charged with drug-related offenses, largely due to Project Intercept, a joint U.S.-Mexico venture to curb international drug traffic.

Because of this drug connection, tales of torture and inhumane treatment coming mostly from young people with middle and upper-middle income backgrounds aroused little sympathy in the U.S. until recently. But there is a growing awareness that the professional drug traffickers and careless youths out for kicks and quick profits aren't alone. A lot of ordinary Americans, including a number of corporate executives, without any apparent criminal connections or intentions are straying into serious and expensive trouble in Mexico.

No one knows how frequently these cases are occurring. The State Department, citing the sovereign rights of Mexico, says it has no grounds to reflect upon the judicial decisions of its neighbor to the south. Other Americans, however, who say they have suffered gross injustice at the hands of the Mexican government, insist they have grounds for reflection.

TROUBLE WITH WINCHESTERS

Donald Postles is one. The 50-year-old president of Moore & Moore Moving & Storage Co., Colorado Springs, Colo., drove into Mexico in February, 1975, on a dove-hunting vacation trip. With him were his brother, Norman, president of Northern National Bank of Colorado Springs, and two other friends. Included in their gear were two Winchester shotguns, which they said they registered in Donald Postles' name with the Mexican consulate in Denver.

The hunting party crossed the border at Nogales, Ariz., without any problem. They were then stopped at a nearby checkpoint where Donald Postles was told that the guns should have been registered at the Mexican border, not in Denver. "All they would have had to do was tell me that and I'd have done

it," Mr. Postles observes. Instead, he was arrested on charges of illegal importing of firearms and contraband, possession of unregistered weapons and entering Mexico to commit a crime.

Mr. Postles was hustled off to jail. "I was under the impression that as an American, all I had to do was notify the American consulate and the wheels would start turning to get me out," he recalls. "Don't believe it. A man from the consulate came to talk to me maybe three times. And even though he would talk to over 25 American prisoners, he didn't even make notes."

ROTATING IN MEXICO

After hiring both American and Mexican lawyers, Mr. Postles' family started a wide-ranging campaign to secure his release. They enlisted the aid of Congressmen, governors and other politicians and bombarded the Mexican Tourist Bureau with daily petitions. After 3½ months in prison and expenditures of about \$25,000 in attorney fees, travel costs and phone bills, the nightmare ended with the charges being dismissed. "I was given a formal apology by Mexican Immigration and told I could come back anytime," Mr. Postles says. "But I'm convinced that if you're a nobody, without any connections, and you get into trouble in Mexico, you'll rot there."

In Nogales, Mexico, Federal Prosecuting Attorney Pedro Mireles concedes that Mr. Postles might have been misinformed by the consulate in Denver, but says that that "isn't a legal excuse to break the law." The charges were dismissed, he says, because an investigation indicated that the alleged violations were unintentional.

Joseph Sabo, 61, had plenty of time on his hands after retiring from a 30-year job as a flight captain for American Airlines. Early last year he happily accepted an offer from a pilot friend, Robert Wantland, 43, to ride along on a hop to Mexico. Mr. Wantland is a Los Angeles aircraft rebuilder who specializes in flying damaged planes to a site where they can be repaired. He had an assignment to pick up and repair a fairly new \$68,750 Bellanca that had landed at a small airport near Culiacan, Mexico.

"I just went along for the ride," Mr. Sabo recalls. But as their plane taxied into the airport at Culiacan, they were intercepted and arrested by federal police. "Apparently they felt initially that we were somehow involved in dope traffic," Mr. Sabo says. "But when they didn't find any dope and our papers were in order, they charged us with trying to steal the airplane we had come to recover."

Mr. Wantland, who had made 44 previous trips to Mexico to recover damaged planes, says, "I had letters from the owner, the lease operator and the insurance company authorizing me to fix and return the plane. I knew the ropes. I had credentials a mile long; everything was in perfect order."

Mexican police contended otherwise. The two spent the next eight days in a 10-foot square holding cell with nine other prisoners, no bedding and a single toilet. "All this time my family was looking for me, but the Mexicans kept denying that we were prisoners," Mr. Sabo says. The two were transferred to a nearby federal prison and were finally located there by pilot friends.

Despite persistent pressure from the American counsel at Mazatlan, a U.S. Senator and a Congressman, it was three months before the two men were released on \$2,400 bond. Charges were later dismissed, but the bond hasn't ever been returned. Mr. Sabo had to pay more than \$10,000 in legal fees and other expenses. The toll for Mr. Wantland was even higher. "It cost me everything," he says. "A \$250,000 business, two airplanes, three cars and a 13-year marriage."

The Bellanca the two men had come to pick up had been stripped of its engine, wheels, propeller and other vital parts and had to be abandoned in Mexico. The plane they had flown to Mexico was missing some

\$3,000 in parts; these had to be shipped in from the U.S. before the plane could be flown back. "The Mexicans knew we hadn't done anything," concludes Mr. Wantland. "They had \$120,000 worth of our airplanes, and they were trying to steal them."

In Culiacan, District Attorney Oscar Duran, who wasn't in office at the time the two men were arrested, says he knows nothing of the case beyond some meager information in the arrest records. At last count, around 140 American-owned airplanes are being held in Mexican custody, according to the International Aviation Theft Bureau, a plane-owners' group.

Alan Glickson, 25, and Marnin Steinberg, 29, are two free-spirited Atlanta entrepreneurs. They went to Mexico in the spring of 1975 to buy handcrafted items that they would in turn resell to retail stores. Mr. Glickson, sporting long hair and a flowing beard, was at first denied entry because of his appearance. He paid \$10 to the border guards and got in, but later rued his persistence.

The two men say their bout with Mexican justice started with a chat in Mexico City with a freelance writer, Curtis Hartman. Mr. Hartman says he told them of the plight of young Americans being held in Mexican prisons and suggested they visit two young American women to cheer them up on the coming Easter Sunday. They went to the Federal Women's Prison in Mexico City and, at the women's suggestion, returned three days later.

When Mr. Glickson and Mr. Steinberg were leaving after the second visit, they were arrested by Mexican police for allegedly engineering the escape of another American woman prisoner on Easter Sunday. Records at the 17th Criminal Court contend that the two bribed two guards and delivered civilian clothes and a visitor's pass to Margaret Mary Hutchins, who then walked out of the prison undetected. The two American men say they don't know Miss Hutchins, never met her at the prison and had nothing to do with her escape.

There's some reason to accept their story. Polygraph tests were given to them for this newspaper by W. A. Robinson & Associates Inc., an Atlanta firm which handles lie detector tests for the Cobb County, Ga., police department. "They didn't do it," says Mr. Robinson, after administering the tests. "They had nothing to do with the girl's escape. In fact, they didn't know her and never met her according to the polygraph tests."

Miss Hutchins, safety back in the U.S., signed a notarized statement saying the two men had nothing to do with her escape. Mr. Hartman says the same thing, adding, "I personally know who did it." And Mr. Glickson observes with some logic, "If I had helped the girl escape, I sure as hell wouldn't have gone back for another visit."

Mr. Steinberg spent his early days in LeCumberri Prison on his hands and knees, naked, scrubbing down latrines. He and Mr. Glickson say they appealed for help from a representative of the U.S. consulate in Mexico City. Both insist they were told: "I don't even want to know what happened to you. Here's a list of Mexican lawyers, but we can't guarantee any of them."

A consular services spokesman for the State Department says in Washington that consular officials always issue a disclaimer. "While we try to see that the lawyer is efficient and honest, we aren't responsible if he loses the case." The spokesman says he doubts the representative refused to listen to the men because "it's part of our function to find out what happened."

A final verdict wasn't reached in the case. After spending a month in prison, Mr. Glickson forfeited a \$7,500 bond and was deported. Mr. Steinberg, whose case was complicated somewhat by a question about the legality of his entry to Mexico, spent two months in jail, forfeited a \$12,000 bond and was deported.

Mexico still holds the men's van, assorted automotive tools and the handcrafted goods they had purchased, all of which they say is worth about \$8,000.

LET'S NOT WAIT ON GETTING THE COUNTRY TOGETHER AND MOVING

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, displaying the editorial leadership for which it is renown, the Wall Street Journal asks why wait on eliminating the double-taxing of dividends when its elimination is desired by the American people, President Ford, the Republican Party platform, Jimmy Carter, Treasury Secretary Simon, Chairman AL ULLMAN of the House Ways and Means Committee, and Chairman RUSSELL LONG of the Senate Finance Committee? Everyone familiar with the issue knows that we cannot really get the U.S. economy on a path of sustained noninflationary growth without removing the tax bias against job-creating capital formation.

The terrible hardships of unemployment and inflation are not necessary. The elimination of this double tax should be immediately brought before the Congress so the people can see how their representatives stand on the issues of jobs and economic progress prior to the November elections.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a political issue and there is no reason to delay economic progress. As the Journal points out, as soon as we eliminate the discrimination and bias in our Tax Code against investment capital, the incentives to production and productivity would soar. As investment, production, and productivity increase, so would the tax base, thus increasing the government's tax revenues. In addition, as the Journal points out—

Americans now content to remain on welfare and unemployment benefits that are financed by the productive sector would realize an economic bonanza is passing them by, as the real incomes of everyone in the work force moved upward and the value of financial assets, pensions and estates increased.

Mr. Speaker, there are millions of Americans who cannot afford to wait for economic growth and new jobs; so why wait?

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 27, 1976]

WHY WAIT ON DOUBLE TAXING?

Jimmy Carter, in almost every discussion he's had with businessmen and the financial press this year, has said he favors ending the double taxation on returns to capital. President Ford and Treasury Secretary Simon not only concur with enthusiasm but have made that explicit proposal to the Congress. The Republicans have it as a plank in their platform and the Democrats are not negative. Nobody seems to dislike the idea.

So why wait? If it is such a sensational idea, and it is, there is absolutely no reason why the economy has to be burdened with the double tax for another week, let alone another six months or year. Mr. Carter wants to take a year or so to look at other aspects of tax reform, but on this one specific he has been so unequivocal that he has thrilled the business and financial community.

There is thus no political issue and no

reason to delay. Instead of keeping it wrapped up in a complex and controversial bundle of tax-reform ideas, President Ford should extract this one proposal and ask Democrats and Republicans in Congress to join hands in whipping it through forthwith, like next week. He should of course concurrently shower praise on Governor Carter for his statesmanship and sagacity in having pinpointed an effective and simple way to stimulate economic growth, and invite him to participate at the bill-signing ceremonies in the Oval Office.

There are very few times when man can play a presidential role even before they are inaugurated. Such a rare opportunity is now available to Mr. Carter, who would be acclaimed by a grateful people for his selflessness and bipartisanship.

We do not put forward this proposal frivolously. Although the issue is little understood by the man in the street, it is thoroughly familiar to the movers and shakers on Capitol Hill. Chairman Al Ullman of the House Ways and Means Committee knows full well that the U.S. economy cannot get back on a path of sustained non-inflationary growth without removing tax disincentives to capital formation. Chairman Russell Long of the Senate Finance Committee is no less keen than we, or Mr. Carter and Mr. Ford, in desiring elimination of the double tax.

The reason the proposal has been dead in the water is best explained by Senator Long, who happens to be a Democrat. Mr. Long tells us that the Democratic Congress would not approve a measure of this magnitude because it was proposed by a Republican President. They are not about to give him the credit.

All right. Boys will be boys, and that's politics. But now that Jimmy Carter has been named leader of his party, almost by unanimous acclamation, the Democratic Congress surely would grant him this one wish. If Mr. Carter's current lead holds up in the public-opinion polls, he would be inaugurated next January during a lovely economic expansion, and could concentrate on promoting love and morality instead of dealing with a stagnant economy.

To show his sincerity, Mr. Ford should even permit Mr. Carter to decide which of the two taxes to eliminate, the tax on corporate profit or the personal tax on the dividend income that flows from already taxed corporate profit. In either case, the incentives to production and productivity would soar. Capital would flow into the U.S. from all over the world, and unutilized capital and labor in the United States would be called into play.

Not only would the tax base expand, multiplying revenues. But Americans now content to remain idle on welfare and unemployment benefits that are financed by the productive sector would realize an economic bonanza is passing them by, as the real incomes of everyone in the work force moved upward and the value of financial assets, pensions and estates increased.

Why should this cornucopia of economic delights lie beyond that national grasp only because Congress is Congress and Mr. Ford doesn't seem to know how to dynamite it into action? Even if Mr. Ford overtook Mr. Carter in November, getting the lion's share of the electorate's gratitude for the incipient expansion, Governor Carter would be remembered fondly by history for having made it all possible.

LT. COL. ALBERT SCOTT

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on September 8, Lt. Col. Albert Scott will leave his

post as executive director of Booth Memorial Medical Center. After 7 years of devoted service, Lt. Col. Albert Scott is being promoted to territorial secretary with the Finance Administration in Manhattan, N.Y.

For the past 5 years, serving as executive director at Booth, Lieutenant Colonel Scott has been both the initiator and driving force behind the operation of the hospital. Under his qualified guidance, Booth Memorial Medical Center has developed into one of the premier medical institutions in New York. Top quality medical care has become synonymous with Booth Memorial.

The loss of Lieutenant Colonel Scott's services at Booth will be immense. He will, however, remain as a member of the board of trustees at the hospital. Replacing him as executive director will be the distinguished Lt. Col. Roland C. Schramm. It is my privilege to publicly acknowledge the achievements of such an esteemed individual, as Lt. Col. Albert Scott. Today, I ask my colleagues to join with me and the people at Booth Memorial Medical Center in congratulating Lieutenant Colonel Scott on his promotion, and applauding the great accomplishments he has attained in the area of health care for the communities of New York. I am proud to pay tribute to such a distinguished individual.

UTILITY RATES

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, across the Nation there has been a 90-percent increase in consumers' utility bills since 1970. In Indiana an amount of electricity that cost \$18 in 1970 cost \$23.59 in 1975. This year costs have again risen, emphasizing the fact that the postwar trend of declining utility rates which lasted until the mid-1960's has given way to today's trend of steadily increasing rates.

The problem of ever-increasing power costs touches most of us once a month. Few problems are brought more frequently to my attention. What has happened? Must we continue to use more and more of our monthly paychecks to pay our electric bills?

A recent FEA study found that several factors have contributed to the rising cost of power, including increased construction costs, increased fuel costs, delays in the regulatory process of licensing and siting, inefficient capacity utilization, new environmental controls, and the uncertainty of future consumer demand levels.

Construction of powerplants is enormously expensive today. Due to environmental and safety requirements, increased construction time, higher interest rates and inflation, it costs five times as much to build a powerplant today as it did in 1967. And once built, powerplants, especially those dependent upon oil for electricity generation are increasingly more expensive to operate. Of the \$7.4 billion revenue increases to investor-owned power companies in 1974, \$5.3 bil-

lion was needed to cover added fuel costs. The bulk of this increase was the result of oil price increases, which have caused the rates in some States to double in the last year. Fortunately for Hoosiers, because of the availability of coal and the high cost of oil generation, Indiana uses only a small amount of oil in electricity—a fact which helps rank Indiana as the 12th lowest in electricity rates among the 50 States.

Numerous questions confront us as we seek to improve the present structuring of utility rates and to devise and implement national energy programs. Does abundant supply come first in energy considerations because of our dependence upon it? Or should the environment receive first priority wherever serious risk of harm is threatened? With the scarcity of resources becoming more critical, should Congress refrain from regulating prices in order to promote extensive investment in the development of new sources of energy?

Does total deregulation of prices, as was proposed in Congress with regard to natural gas, mean that wealthy consumers are allowed the privilege of using the resources while the poor are prevented from doing so? Should prices be manipulated to control levels of demand or to promote conservation? Should rate schedules be flattened, or should large users be permitted to pay less per unit than small consumers, as is often the case today?

Congress has recently taken several steps to investigate and make needed improvements in the structuring of utility rates. Recently passed legislation directs the FEA to develop voluntary guidelines to encourage State regulatory commissions to adopt "innovative" rate structures, including the flattening of rate schedules to treat all consumers equally. Assistance is authorized to those commissions making such changes. The Congress has also authorized grants to State consumer services which represent consumers in utility regulatory proceedings.

In addition, the Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee has recently undertaken an investigation in Indiana of the role of the Federal Power Commission in supplying power and setting rates. There are charges that the Commission has contributed to higher rates by not doing its job effectively.

Furthermore, the right of utilities to make automatic fuel cost adjustments in rates has been limited by the Indiana General Assembly. Companies must now present evidence and justify rate increases rather than simply passing them on to consumers without prior review.

Much more, however, remains to be done. More uniformity and more clarity needs to be instilled into rate structures and rate-setting procedures. Better definitions of what companies should be allowed to include in costs need to be drafted. Hearings on fuel adjustment clauses need to be required to protect consumers. Peak-period pricing concepts need to be explored and implemented where appropriate. And rates paid by different categories of consumers—residential, commercial, and industrial—need to be made more uniform. Subcommittee figures show that many residential

users pay five or six times as much as some industrial users.

It is past time for a thorough examination and review of utility rate structures throughout the country and for specific steps to be taken in the direction of establishing fees based on actual cost of service. It hurts each of us when the rates charged some do not produce enough money to pay the cost of generating and delivering the electricity used.

OPEN RULE VITAL ON LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the text of my statement to the House Rules Committee today in support of an open rule on the legislative appropriations bill, H.R. 14238:

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to strongly urge the Members of this Committee to adopt an open rule for consideration of H.R. 14238, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for FY 1977.

This would be far from an unusual procedure. As all of us know, it is virtually unheard of for any appropriations bill not to be open to all germane amendments on the floor. Given the widely publicized events of recent months and the erosion of public confidence in the Congress, it's inconceivable that this important piece of legislation could go to the floor under anything but an open rule.

We must demonstrate our willingness to bring the internal spending of the Congress out of the shadowy backrooms and into the open where the American people can see how each and every Congressman stands on Congressional spending. This is an opportunity for us to bring about meaning reform that will help restore the people's faith in their elected Representatives.

The granting of an open rule by this Committee in no way implies approval on the part of its individual members for any amendments that may be offered on the floor. It merely shows the American people that the Members of this Committee are willing to permit all Members of the House to stand up and be counted on the way they want to spend tax dollars on the legislative branch of government. If individual Members of the House then decide that they do not want spending reform, they should have an opportunity to publicly say so in a recorded vote.

I think the people of this country are tired of unfulfilled promises of government in the sunshine, unfulfilled promises of reform in the Congress—and I think they are tired of hearing about promises of greater restraint in the spending of tax dollars within the Congress itself. They don't want promises, they want action—and they are not going to get it if this committee imposes a gag rule on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, without an open rule on this bill, no professions of honesty and openness in government are going to be worth very much. This committee will have reinforced the all too commonly held opinion that this Congress takes care of its own.

If that is the image this Committee wants to convey, then it can certainly do that effectively by imposing a gag rule to protect

those Members of the House who might desire the appearance of openness—without accepting the responsibilities of openness.

I strongly urge this Committee to give us the opportunity to restore confidence in the legislative branch by permitting all germane amendments to be offered on the House floor when this bill is debated.

Thank you very much.

VARIATIONS IN SOCIAL SECURITY CLAIMS PROCESSING TIMES: THE NEED FOR IMPROVEMENT

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee has been studying the impact of the supplemental security income—SSI—program for the aged, blind, and disabled on Social Security Administration operations. We have encountered statistics showing wide variations among Social Security offices in processing times for various types of claims:

These statistics may indicate that some Social Security offices are considerably more efficient than others in processing the various types of retirement, SSI, and disability claims.

For example, through 6/23/76, Denver area offices were completing disability applications in 171 minutes, while the same type of claim was taking more than an hour longer to process—some 235 minutes—in the New York area.

Processing times for the regular retirement income claim—the claim that most individuals file to start their retirement checks flowing—varied from 96 minutes in the Atlanta area to 128 minutes in the Denver area.

SSI disability claims, which are probably the hardest to process, took from as little as 228 minutes in the Atlanta area to almost exactly five hours (292 minutes) in the New York area.

While there were some increases in productivity over the 3 years since the start of SSI, in general, it is now taking longer to process regular disability and SSI disability claims than it did 3 years ago.

I have written to Social Security Commissioner Cardwell asking for an explanation of the data. Portions of my inquiry to the Commissioner follow:

While the longer processing times in the disability areas may reflect a commendable effort to improve the quality and accuracy of determinations, the enormous variations in processing time are difficult to understand.

It appears that some Social Security areas may have developed better training and management techniques to increase productivity. As you know, because of the enormous number of claims filed each year, differences of as much as an hour or more in processing time can mean tens of millions of dollars in additional administrative costs charged to the hard-pressed Social Security Trust Funds.

I hope that Social Security will conduct a study to determine what causes these differences in productivity.

As you know, the Ways and Means Oversight Subcommittee has been concerned

about the enormous variation in Social Security training programs and the fact that there is no set test or "final examination" before workers are sent to the field to begin processing claims. I am concerned that these large variations in processing times reflect the "casualness" of Social Security training policy.

BRITISH VISITOR LAUDS DEPORTMENT OF PITTSBURGH YOUTH

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, with all of the negative comments people seem to hurl at young people these days, it is a pleasure when one can point out exemplary behavior by the young.

And this is exactly what an English visitor to Pittsburgh, during our recent local Bicentennial celebration, did in a letter to the Pittsburgh Press.

Peter McDonough, a resident of Liverpool, in describing what he encountered in Pittsburgh on July 4, wrote:

I saw young Americans of all complexions acting towards each other and towards their elders in a manner which reflects great credit not only on themselves but on their parents and teachers.

Mr. McDonough also was very impressed with the quality of Pittsburgh's celebration.

I think all Americans can be proud that the people of Pittsburgh allowed a visitor from another country to return home with such wonderful impressions of this country.

It is with great pleasure that I include in the RECORD at this time Mr. McDonough's letter:

VISITOR ACCLAIMS PITTSBURGH BEHAVIOR

I am writing to offer my sincere congratulations and thanks to the people of the great and beautiful city of Pittsburgh.

As a visitor from Liverpool, England, I recently had the unforgettable experience of attending your Memorial Day program at Gateway Center and your Independence Day celebrations.

I cannot find words to describe the joy and exhilaration of witnessing Americans of all complexions, ages, shapes and sizes having fun together.

America's entertainers and musicians have always been your country's greatest and most beloved ambassadors.

I was not surprised, therefore, by the standard of professionalism and artistry displayed by them.

I must tell you, however, that nothing impressed me more than the behavior and deportment of your young people.

I saw young Americans of all complexions acting towards each other and towards their elders in a manner which reflects great credit not only on themselves but on the parents and teachers.

As a European long-accustomed to hearing nothing but bad publicity about you and your country, I want to thank you for showing this visitor to your city that people of all ethnic backgrounds, ages and occupations can work and play together!

PETER McDONOUGH.

LIVERPOOL, ENGLAND.

FIRST DISTRICT OF IOWA QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. EDWARD MEZVINSKY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. MEZVINSKY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this summer, I mailed a questionnaire to the residents of the First District of Iowa asking fellow Iowans for their opinions on several varied issues.

Using the input of three Congressional Outreach Offices and a mobile unit—in addition to contacts with our Washington office and during town meetings in Iowa—we attempted to raise issues which are of concern to the people I represent. I am pleased to report that the heartening response indicates that we were successful.

Approximately 20,000 Iowans responded, letting me know how they stand on issues that require the attention of all of us in the House of Representatives.

Beyond the readily apparent value of the information provided by response to our questionnaire, a special benefit was that it served as a catalyst for hundreds of Iowans to go beyond the limits of the printed form's yes/no format. Additional comments—either written in the margins of the questionnaire or in separate accompanying letters—expanded on the questions posed and often detailed the writers' thoughts on separate issues. These comments were especially interesting and helpful to me.

We have now completed the tabulation of the questionnaire. I call my colleagues' attention to the results which follow.

FIRST DISTRICT OF IOWA QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Federal spending is always a major issue and the way our tax money is spent has a major impact on the economy and upon our lives. Listed below are many areas where federal dollars are spent. Please indicate if you would like to see (1) more; (2) less; or (3) about the same spent on each category.

[In percent]

	More	Less	Same
Defense	16.9	41.4	41.7
Revenue sharing	31.4	27.9	40.7
Crime control	54.2	10.9	34.9
Pollution control	50.5	17.3	32.2
Energy research	75.6	5.2	19.2
Public transportation	47.2	19.8	33.0
Education	42.4	16.3	41.3
Foreign military aid	1.1	89.1	9.8
Aid to the elderly	58.7	6.4	34.9

2. Which policy would you favor regarding Social Security?

- (a) keep Social Security benefits at current levels, 29.8.
- (b) increase benefits from general Treasury revenues, 28.2
- (c) increase employee-employer contributions (now 5.85 per cent), 10.5.
- (d) increase amount of earnings taxed (present ceiling \$15,300), 31.5.

3. Where should the government devote its resources in seeking energy independence?

- (a) further development of domestic coal & petroleum resources, 20.5.
- (b) nuclear energy development, 14.3.
- (c) alternative sources of energy: solar, geothermal, synthetic fuels, 61.4.
- (d) other, 3.8.

4. Various proposals are before the Congress concerning the control of firearms. Which of the following do you favor?

(a) legislation requiring registration of all firearms, 31.1.

(b) legislation outlawing the sale and possession of handguns, 26.2.

(c) no new legislation in this area, 34.9.

(d) other, 7.8.

5. Regarding federal assistance to the needy, which approach would you favor?

(a) present system with welfare, food stamps, Medicaid, etc., 9.5.

(b) establish a minimum family income through the tax system, 17.2.

(c) provide public service jobs to all who are able to work but, cannot find jobs, 73.3.

6. What should be done regarding Locks and Dam 26 at Alton?

(a) repair the existing structure, 30.8.

(b) build a new lock and dam, 20.5.

(c) conduct a short-term study before deciding, 44.2.

(d) other, 4.5.

7. In regard to General Revenue Sharing with state and local governments, which of the following do you prefer?

(a) five-year blanket approval with no restrictions, 17.8.

(b) annual funding with periodic review and oversight by Congress, 61.9.

(c) no revenue sharing program, 20.3.

8. In view of evidence that the bankruptcy of a city or state could have severe consequences to the entire national economy, what policy do you think Congress should adopt?

(a) a direct grant of funds, 5.3.

(b) loans with local spending/wage constraints, 65.3.

(c) no help, 29.5.

9. What action should the government take to help turn the economy around and get people back to work?

(a) put people to work in the public and private sector through jobs programs, 60.6.

(b) tax incentives to business, 23.7.

(c) no government action, 15.7.

POINTS TO NEED FOR HONEST PAY RAISE BILL

HON. CHARLES A. MOSHER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House is scheduled to begin debating H.R. 14238, the legislative appropriations bill. One of the amendments that will be offered—and I understand there are Members on both sides of the aisle who are prepared to offer it—would knock out the cost-of-living pay raise for Members of Congress during fiscal year 1977.

I expect to vote in support of this amendment, but I will do so with regret.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that we must attempt to correct our previous legislative mistake by means of an amendment to an appropriations bill. Also, I regret that the House has totally failed to respond to repeated suggestions that we improve our system of salary determination.

For a number of years, we muddled along under a terrible system that required special legislation to change the congressional salary level. The result was that we went for 6 years without any above board, forthright change in salary.

Meanwhile, inflation raged, the House Administration Committee devised a number of sneaky, backdoor devices to increase Members' nonsalary compensation, and top-level Federal civil servants suffered under a prolonged salary freeze.

Last year, under cover of the rush to-

ward the August recess, and aided by exceptional parliamentary maneuvering, the Senate and House voted to put Congressmen on the Federal cost-of-living pay index system.

I voted against that move, as did a number of my colleagues, because I thought this was simply responding to a bad problem with a bad solution, and with bad procedures.

It is my very strong belief that we should not wait any longer to adopt a rational system whereby the Congress can make necessary salary adjustments for itself on a rational, above-board basis.

As you know, I proposed H.R. 9336 last September as an alternative, and I have been joined by a bipartisan coalition of about 50 cosponsors.

H.R. 9336 simply states that whenever Congress votes itself a pay raise, whether we do so by specific act or by a decision on cost-of-living increases, then that pay raise will not go into effect until the next Congress is seated.

In other words, I proposed that we require that a general election must occur between the time a salary increase is voted and the time it goes into effect.

This proposal parallels language that already exists in the constitution of my home State of Ohio. In fact, State legislatures in about 20 other States also are bound by similar constitutional or statutory provisions.

My purpose now is not to promote my legislation for any action tomorrow. Several of us tried to push it on various occasions in the past year, but the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has refused to schedule a hearing on it.

Rather, my purpose today is to remind my colleagues, and the public, that we have not yet taken any positive action to dig ourselves out of the hole we created last summer.

I do not care if we accept my specific proposal or one of the other, similar ideas that have been put forward. But I do want to note that sooner or later the Congress must adopt a rational policy regarding our pay raises, so that we do not again have to resort to "playing games" with amendments to appropriations bills, as we will tomorrow, in order to correct our legislative folly.

So, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, I will vote in favor of the expected amendment to prohibit an automatic cost-of-living pay raise for Members of Congress during fiscal year 1977, but I will do so with regret.

LOOKING BACK AT VIETNAM

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, if our foreign policy is to promote America's goals over the next decade, it is essential that we learn from our successes and mistakes of the past decade.

Certainly as time develops between the present and America's involvement in the Vietnam war, I believe it is essential that we continue to look back and judge

what we did right and wrong in that conflict.

Toward that end, I would like to submit for the RECORD the following editorial from the August 9 edition of the Johnstown Tribune-Democrat:

ANOTHER LOOK AT VIETNAM WAR

When the United States was up to its ears in the horribleness of the Vietnam War, many Americans were wont to believe only those pronouncements coming from Hanoi—pronouncements generally to the effect that we were intruding on a domestic squabble, albeit a military one.

Therefore, maybe—just maybe—those same people will now listen to the words of one Gen. Van Tien Dung, North Vietnam's chief of staff. The Wall Street Journal, editorializing on the general's memoirs, noted some highly significant phrases; and those phrases decidedly put to rest the fantasy that the Vietnam War was a civil war—whether the doubters like it or not. And The Journal wraps up its opinion like this:

"The Vietnam War is better put behind us, since there were more than enough mistakes and errors in judgment to go around. But before the revisionist theory of how and why the U.S. got involved becomes official doctrine, from which no one dare dissent, it's worth mentioning that official Washington was right about one thing, at least: the Vietnam War was a war between two separate states, one of which invaded the other. And the recent unification (of North and South Vietnam) is not a sign that Saigon—pardon us, Ho Chi Minh City—is eager to become an appendage of the north. It is only a sign that aggression, like crime, sometimes pays."

The Journal, quoting from a New York Times account of the general's memoirs, notes:

"Apparently because the Communists have now essentially achieved reunification of the North and the South, Gen. Dung makes no effort to preserve earlier Communist claims that there was a separate movement in the South, which they called the National Liberation Front and the Americans termed the Viet Cong. On the contrary, Gen. Dung, who is a member of the Politburo of the Lao Dong or Workers' party, provides a vivid description of how the Politburo and the Central Military party committee, operating from what he calls 'Dragon House' in Hanoi, directed the war."

Okay. There it is. The United States did not stick its military nose into a private and civil war. This nation answered a legitimate call for help from another nation, revisionist nonsense to the contrary.

CALL FOR RESIGNATION OF JOHN CONNALLY FROM THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE ADVISORY BOARD

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues I am inserting in the RECORD a letter I sent to President Ford urging the removal of John Connally from the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. The text follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 14, 1976.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write to urge that you request the immediate resignation of John Connally from the Foreign Intelligence

Advisory Board. The conflict between Mr. Connally's public role as a member of the Board and his private role as chairman of the Citizens Alliance for Mediterranean Freedom—in which he openly advocates interference or, as he terms it, "meddling," in the internal affairs of foreign governments—can only be reconciled by his resignation.

In February you affirmed your commitment to a "comprehensive program" of reform of the intelligence agencies to halt documented past abuses. As part of the broader effort at reform, you expanded the membership of the Board and reappointed John Connally to it. Yet any promise of reform your action may have inspired is severely compromised by Mr. Connally's continued presence on the Board. To permit an individual who actively and professionally endorses the concept of U.S. intervention abroad to review our intelligence efforts represents a major step backwards in the concept of effective oversight.

For the Board to provide "independent, nonpartisan advice on the effectiveness of our foreign intelligence efforts," as you stressed on March 11, the members themselves must be impartial, dispassionate and objective. An individual who is devoting a portion of his private life to heading an organization whose express purpose is overt interference in the internal affairs of foreign governments can hardly be said to possess the degree of impartiality necessary to review covert interference in the affairs of these same governments by the intelligence agencies. The intelligence agencies themselves are capable and zealous advocates of their plans and programs. If the overseers and analysts are equally zealous advocates, then the oversight and review process becomes irretrievably impaired.

In a June 6 New York Times ad, John Connally announced the formation of the Citizens Alliance for Mediterranean Freedom, an activist organization that would concern itself with the "deteriorating situation in Southern Europe, the Middle East and Northern Africa." As its first order of business, Mr. Connally stated, the organization would attempt to warn Italian citizens "not to become beguiled by the unfulfilled promises of communism." To this end, Mr. Connally continued, an effort would be made to recruit "millions" of Americans to carry out a "vigorous program of activity" which would include the establishment of "communications" between "concerned Americans and their counterparts in Mediterranean nations." When asked if such activities constituted "meddling" in the internal affairs of foreign countries, Mr. Connally conceded that such action "probably is meddling" (Houston Post, May 4).

The case of Italy provides a clear illustration of the incompatibility of Mr. Connally's public and private sector roles. Last December, in briefings of congressional committees, then CIA Director William Colby reported your approval of \$6 million in secret cash payments to individual anti-Communist political leaders in Italy . . . in an effort to prevent Communist gains" (New York Times, January 7). As a member of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, whose purpose is to review the objectives, conduct and management of the overall national intelligence effort (Executive Order 11460), Mr. Connally would be expected to make recommendations on our intelligence efforts in Italy. But as head of a private group that is actively engaged in furthering specific political objectives in Italy, it is inconceivable that Mr. Connally would be in a position to provide the Executive Office with a detached and balanced assessment of the scope and direction of our foreign intelligence efforts in that country.

While Mr. Connally's public and private positions may not directly violate any conflict of interest statutes, his simultaneous roles as advisor and advocate contravene the

spirit of public policy directed at intelligence community reform. Thus I find it clearly improper—indeed, alarming—that an individual charged with the serious responsibility of evaluation of intelligence activities should compromise this obligation by pursuing private ends through a course of action which in his own words constitutes "meddling" in the internal affairs of other countries. After a year of public debate over the need for intelligence community reform, Mr. Connally's continued presence on the Board only heightens the prevailing public skepticism about the seriousness of Executive efforts to strengthen the oversight and review process.

The history of abuses by our intelligence agencies can be directly traced to superficial or nonexistent oversight by Executive and Legislative authorities. In the interest of the reforms you affirmed earlier this year, I am taking this opportunity to urge in the strongest terms that you give this matter your immediate and most serious consideration. Clearly the only appropriate response is that you request Mr. Connally's immediate resignation from the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board.

Yours sincerely,

MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON.

MAYOR DALEY DEPLORES FLIGHT OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on July 11 at the Statue of Liberty in New York, an inspiring and timely ceremony was held in honor of the captive nations of the world. Highlighting "The Bicentennial Salute to the Captive Nations," were speeches by the mayors of our two largest cities—Abraham Beame of New York and Richard Daley of Chicago. As I have many times in the past, I too was privileged to participate in what I believe was the most impressive captive nations event in many years.

Mayor Daley received a "Liberty Award" for his long-time contributions to the cause of the captive nations and peoples. In response, he declared in part—

I stand with you on behalf of the captive nations in your work for the day when all our brothers and sisters suffering under oppression are again free men and free women.

We look forward to the day when every captive nation in the world will have a statue of liberty.

I insert Mayor Daley's remarks in the RECORD at this point and commend them to my colleagues:

REMARKS BY MAYOR RICHARD DALEY OF CHICAGO

George Meany, Dr. Lev Dobriansky, chairman, National Captive Nations Committee, Georgetown University, Members and friends of the National Captive Nations Committee, fellow Americans:

I am very happy to be with you today to take part in this great Bicentennial salute to the captive nations.

It is so appropriate that this ceremony is taking place here at this unique and inspiring symbol of our country—the Statue of Liberty. Here the torch of liberty has been held high for generations of immigrants coming to our wonderful land.

We are all immigrants ourselves or the descendants of immigrants. Most of our fore-

bearers came here with little in the sense of worldly goods, but they and we were given the gift of becoming Americans—with all of the blessings and opportunities that has meant.

Our forebearers would never want us to forget what this Statue of Liberty means—and would never want us to forget what it means not to have freedom.

In coming here today to salute the captive nations all of us are keeping faith with our heritage. We know that all nations have a right to be free—and we know there is a bond between America and all countries which seek liberty.

Captive Nations Week—and the work of the National Captive Nations Committee—are continuing reminders the United States will never let the world forget that the Captive Nations must be free.

We here today are united with the people of Eastern Europe, Asia, Cuba and captive nations everywhere in our determination that we will never rest until oppressed people have achieved the rights to which they are entitled.

It is particularly fitting that the AFL-CIO has played such an essential role in the continuing support for the aspirations of the captive nations. The men and women of America's free labor movement know there are no free labor movements in the nations under Communist domination. The role of labor in this Bicentennial salute is a tremendous tribute to George Meany and the leadership of the AFL-CIO.

And this ceremony here today is a tribute to the whole city of New York which, throughout American history, has served as the mother city for the immigrants of the world who have come to these shores.

I stand with you on behalf of the captive nations in your work for the day when all our brothers and sisters suffering under oppression are again free men and free women.

We look forward to the day when every captive nation in the world will have a Statue of Liberty.

TETON DAM

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the Record a brief report on the field hearings the House Interior Committee's Subcommittee on Water and Power held this weekend in Idaho concerning the failure of the Teton Dam.

The subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over the Bureau of Reclamation projects, met with Bureau officials for briefings on both Friday and Saturday past. We also inspected the damsite from the air and ground and also inspected the area downriver which suffered extensive damage as a result of the failure.

The Teton Dam is, of course, an extremely large project which was more than 3½ years in construction. It was a zoned earthfill embankment composed of five specific zones. It is important to note that Government inspectors were present at all times during the placing of the zones to see that requirements of the specifications were met.

At this moment, the Bureau of Reclamation is still seeking the specific cause of the failure, for while we know it was

the result of internal erosion, the Bureau is seeking the specific cause of the erosion.

To this end the Bureau engineers are now excavating the side of the dam where they have determined the failure began. Hopefully, a definitive answer as to the exact cause of the failure will be forthcoming. That is the main concern of the subcommittee. We need to know what caused the failure to prevent any like event in the future.

In addition to meeting with Bureau engineers and reviewing the structural problems at the dam, we also inspected that area damaged by the failure and discussed what was being done by various Federal and local agencies to solve the many problems caused downriver.

I think there is a pressing need to free the river of the vast amounts of materials which were poured into the river at the time of the failure. It is necessary to get this dredging operation going as quickly as possible to avoid spring runoff flooding which is going to occur if the river is not cleared.

As for the question of whether the dam should be rebuilt, I think that is something which is properly left to the residents of the area who suffered through the disaster and who would have to foot the bill. It is probably something which should be decided through a referendum.

Putting present concerns aside, the most important issue is that of discovering the cause of the failure and making sure it doesn't happen again.

MEXICAN LAND INVASION DANGERS NOTED IN LOS ANGELES

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times has at last taken cognizance of events south of the border to which we have been calling attention recently. While I do not agree with the casual attitude expressed by many of those quoted in the article, it is at least gratifying that a large-circulation American daily is beginning to note the scale and gravity of the attacks upon rural landholdings in Mexico, and the implications of them, which range from a threat to the food supply in both Mexico and the United States, to the revolution frankly desired by those who conduct—and tolerate—these invasions. The following article appeared on August 29:

THOUSANDS OF POOR INVADE MEXICO'S PRODUCE FARMS—OBSERVERS BELIEVE SITUATION IN TWO STATES COULD LEAD TO RURAL CIVIL WAR; VEGETABLES FOR UNITED STATES CURTAILED

(By Evan Maxwell)

CULIACAN, SINALOA.—The rivers of north-west Mexico, the Maya, the Tamazula, the Yaqui, the Fuerte and the Sonora, wind down from the Sierra Madre to irrigate an international vegetable garden—and germinate the seeds of conflict between peasant farm workers and big landholders.

Brought under control by a series of large, earth-fill dams, the rivers now bring life to a land that was next to worthless from pre-Columbian times until less than 30 years ago.

Men still alive were the pioneers of this country—fighting a tropical climate where 110-degree heat and hurricane-spawned swamps yield disease-bearing clouds of insects and dense stands of head-high thornbush.

These pioneers endured the tropical discomforts, hacked back the thornbush and found soil that was perhaps the richest in Mexico. With water from their own irrigation systems and from their own irrigation systems and from the public works dams begun after World War II by the Mexican government, they turned the broad coastal valleys into the vegetable bin of Mexico.

Not only is it the most important single source of food for Mexico, but it also provides a large quantity of the fresh vegetables Americans consume during the winter.

Last year, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture inspection station at Nogales, Ariz., more than 1.1 billion pounds of fresh vegetables crossed the U.S. border from Sinaloa and Sonora. That amounts to almost 60% of the produce, other than bananas, shipped into the United States in 1975.

At the height of the season, more than 300 trucks a day make the 16-hour trip from Culiacan to Nogales, where the produce is shifted to American transport lines and shipped all over the country.

But this year the flow of vegetables and other farm produce—both that bound for the United States and that bound for the population centers of Mexico—will be curtailed, some believe destroyed, by a social-political crisis with roots in Mexico's revolutionary tradition.

Modern Mexico was born of an agrarian revolution. "The campesinos (peasants) and the latifundistas (large landowners) have been struggling for centuries," said the manager of a large farm near Culiacan. "Our revolutions have always been sparked by fights over possession of the land. Now we have another one."

The situation in Sonora and Sinaloa has not yet broken down into revolution, most observers agree. But there have been incidents of violence and extreme unrest over the past six months that some feel may carry the seeds of a rural civil war, if those seeds are allowed to germinate.

Since last October, thousands of campesinos, the rural proletariat of revolutionary Mexico, have been invading the fields of proprietarios, private farmers who have banded together to hold perhaps a quarter of the land in the region and whose use of modern agribusiness methods have yielded them a disproportionate share of farm production.

The invaders, seeking possession of developed lands, have physically occupied farms, disrupting the farm routines. They have invaded in groups of 20 to 200, in what is clearly an organized campaign.

In some cases, their stays have been short, lasting only three or four weeks until they were bribed to leave by the landowners. Sometimes they occupied a property for a set period of time, say two weeks, before moving on to cause disruptions elsewhere to publicize their demands.

There have been cases, however, in which the landless campesinos took permanent possession of the land.

Although the farm invasions have been a nationwide phenomenon, the most intense and violent confrontations between campesinos and farmers have taken place in Sinaloa and Sonora.

The most serious incident took place last fall when the army was called out by Sonora Gov. Carlos Armando Blebrich, considered by many to be one of the brightest young lead-

ers in Mexico, to clear the fields of a ranch near Ciudad Obregon.

In a bloody 10-minute battle, both sides suffered casualties. Seven of the campesinos were killed, and as a result, the federal government ousted Biebrich and replaced him with a man more in sympathy with the campesino movement.

The pitched battle of San Ignacio Rio Norte has not been repeated, but the invasions have continued, as has the resistance to them by the landowners, a wealthy and powerful group and the single most important body in the private sector of northern Mexico.

In a show of power unusual among private businessmen, the growers last November parked all their farm machinery along major highways during a three-day strike protesting what they said were officially sanctioned attempts to destroy private enterprise on the land.

They mounted extensive and expensive advertising campaigns in national newspapers, seeking to enlist support from other factions of the private sector.

Through the winter and spring and into the summer, the invasions continued. Grower sources in Culiacan say that on any given day, more than 30 properties of varying sizes are occupied.

In the past few weeks, the campesinos have broadened their campaign. Last week outside Culiacan, the leader of a farm employee union friendly to growers was kidnapped by an armed band and held for 24 hours.

The offices of El Debate, a Culiacan newspaper sympathetic to the growers, were stoned and then surrounded by a crowd of 200 campesinos intent on preventing publication. The crowd remained for two days.

And in Culiacan, already known for an extreme violence as a result of internecine battles between rival narcotics traffickers, there were reports last week that campesino groups had been planning torchlight parades through wealthy neighborhoods to intimidate growers and other members of the upper class.

These seeds of ferment and violence in Culiacan and elsewhere have fallen on ground that is always fertile—the longstanding, almost eternal, tension between those who have land and those who do not.

Other volatile elements have been added to the situation this year, not the least of which is the process that is perhaps the most important in Mexican politics—the transfer of power from an old president to a new one every six years.

Wednesday President Luis Echeverria is to give his final formal address to the Mexican National Congress. The speech, or "informa," will, according to the president's spokesmen, recap the highlights of Echeverria's six years in power and will make some "suggestions" about the possible course of his successor, José Lopez Portillo.

Echeverria's final "informa" will be very closely watched by the northwest landowners, by the leaders of the campesinos and by others. "We expect that speech to be very important," said a leader of Mexico's private sector. "That may tell us whether the private landowners and all of the private sector are really in trouble."

Echeverria is blamed by the landowners for many, if not most, of their problems. His action in ousting the Sonoran governor, Biebrich, last October was seen as a signal to the campesinos that their cause and their method—invasion—had government support.

In the interim, Echeverria has done little about the conflict, the growers say. In fact, many of his government's actions have increased the difficulty, they say.

The Secretariat of Agrarian Reform has, for instance, called into question the con-

stitutionality of ownership of more than 20% of the privately held land.

"In March, we were told there was no legal problem with our title to the land," said one worried grower. "Then in July, we were told we held the land illegally, that the government would confiscate it."

The order, issued July 14, pertains to 40,000 hectares (one hectare equals 2.47 acres) of prime irrigated land in Sinaloa and 80,000 hectares, half of it irrigated, in Sonora.

According to an American familiar with Mexican agrarian law, the July 14, order, made by Agrarian Reform Secretary Felix Barra Garcia was based on a particular reading of the Mexican Constitution.

The constitution states that every man is entitled to 100 hectares of land; no person could own more than that. The law was an outgrowth of the revolutionary Mexican goal—to break up the vast land holdings of the wealthy latifundistas.

Barra Garcia's order held that the constitution meant to prohibit the holding of more than 100 hectares by a single family group or any group acting in concert. That view is challenged by many others, including those who farm large holdings in the northwest. They maintain that it is not illegal for family groups to hold more than 100 hectares, each parcel in the name of a family member.

The distinction is crucial to those privately held operations in which family members and others have joined to form varying types of cooperatives and to apply modern technology, machinery and business methods to the overall management of the land, usually in intensive farming of vegetables for export.

"My family came here in the 1940s, fought the land, and built their farms," said one American-educated ranch manager. "Now the government tells me that because my father's land is being farmed in cooperation with his brother's and my brother's and mine and others—because we all grow vegetables and pack them in the same packing-house, because of that we are the new latifundistas."

"Latifundista is the worst kind of insult you can call a Mexican farmer, but that is what they are calling us, and they are taking away our land because of it."

Most dispassionate observers agree that the constitutional system of land ownership has been abused to some degree, particularly by "name-borrowers" who secure land by encouraging friends and distant relatives to sign deeds and then allow the name-borrower to keep effective use, and nearly all the profits, from the land.

But those same observers say that the abuses have not been nearly as widespread as indicated by the Secretariat of Agrarian Reform and by the statements of Echeverria, who has called numerous times in the past six months for destruction of the latifundistas and the dispersion of their lands among the campesinos.

Accomplishment of this would, according to the large growers, mean that the privately held land now in labor-intensive crops like vegetables would revert to 100-hectare fields of wheat, soybeans or less-intensive crops.

"The ejidatario (homesteader) farming a small parcel can't afford the large capital outlay and doesn't have the know-how for the export crops," said one grower from Ciudad Obregon.

"The vegetable crops mean many thousands of jobs for Mexico and millions of dollars in income from foreign trade, but somehow the secretary for agrarian reform and Echeverria don't seem to care about that. All they want is land for the campesinos," he said.

Other views are less critical of Echeverria and Barra Garcia. "This whole process is characteristic of the wind-up of an administration," said one observer in Mexico City. "Every president wants to go out a national hero by reviving the old revolutionary ideals—land for the masses—one more time."

"So far the growers have been treated to a great deal of nasty rhetoric from Echeverria. But they have not really been hurt too badly."

That view is echoed by others who consider the invasion and turmoil perfectly predictable in the process of Mexican politics. There may be more pressure on the private landholders at the end of Echeverria's term, they say, but that too is explainable.

"Because farming has been so successful in Sinaloa and Sonora, the population growth there has been even higher than in the rest of Mexico, as much as 4% a year, as more people try to go there," said one diplomatic source.

Other economic factors have intervened. A miserable world market for cotton has resulted in fivefold cutbacks in plantings in southern Sonora.

"Normally, perhaps 50,000 workers would be involved in that crop for four to six months" said an American who is familiar with the situation. "They come from all over Mexico, work for six months and then go home with their savings to live the rest of the year."

"Because of the cutbacks in planting, many of them came but could not find work. They had no way of getting home, so they are stranded in Sonora. Those stranded workers have been the shock troops of the invasions because they are desperate."

Within this view, Echeverria's rhetoric, so discomforting to the private landholders, has been nothing more than a part of the necessary political process of absorbing the pressure generated by large, hopeless masses of campesinos.

It is a process that comes to a head each six years and has always in the past, resulted in the granting of some concessions to the campesino forces, concessions that even some growers agree are necessary.

"This is a country that has been built on the backs of the campesinos," said one Culiacan businessman who is in general sympathy with the growers.

"There are 30 million small farmers in the country who have no water, no electricity; they, too, deserve something. All Echeverria is trying to do is to see that they get it."

But there are other, less moderate views of what is going on in Sinaloa and Sonora, much more threatened by the current events of the past six months. "When the invasions first started, many of my friends said it was just the same old thing, that it would end up with the growers losing 20,000 hectares to the campesinos and then all would be quiet again."

"But these friends no longer feel the same way. This time things are different."

He said the situation is different because of the intensity of the pressure for land when there is no unoccupied, arable land to give, and because the private landholders feel much more threatened by the current events than they have in previous years.

"They have begun to feel that the government is out after all their land, not just a small part of it. And some of them feel very distinctly that the agrarian reform problem is only part of a larger campaign against the entire private sector—commerce and industry as well as agriculture."

The belief that the private landowners are the standard-bearers of the private sector is common among growers. One grower from Los Mochis said, "Echeverria is out to do away with us. He and some forces in the government are moving toward the left with great

speed. When they are done with us, they will take all the other forms of private enterprise."

That sentiment may be extreme, particularly in ascribing radical leftist aspirations to Echeverria.

To those of other political persuasions, Echeverria's actions on the land question, taken in conjunction with moves to solidify his own personal power base even as his presidency draws to an official close, signal an attempt to retain a large degree of control in his successor's administration.

"He has packed the congress and some of the unions with men loyal to him," one Mexico City observer said.

"Lopez Portillo is going to have a very rough time weeding out the government," he said, "a much rougher time than previous presidents. He starts with many strikes against him."

Lopez Portillo has been relatively quiet on the land question in the months since he was named as the candidate for president by PRI, Mexico's dominant political party.

One of the few public statements on the matter, issued this month, indicated to growers that he might be more favorably disposed toward their position than Echeverria had been.

The statement said, in effect, that the old rhetoric about land ownership should be softened and that the nation should get on with the important job of agricultural production.

The growers seemed to take the statement as a sign that Lopez Portillo would sanction their continued existence on grounds that they had shown themselves to be highly productive members of the agricultural sector, more efficient certainly than the ejidos, small communal farms that result from expropriation of private land.

But Lopez Portillo's statements have not calmed all the fears of the private landholders of Sonora and Sinaloa. The invasions continue unabated, and the July 14 order to turn over the 120,000 acres of land, though stayed by the Mexican courts for the present, still hangs over the as-yet-unplanted fields of the northwest.

One grower said, "We must be able to clear up this question of private ownership if we are to continue to farm using the methods we have developed."

"We feel we have obtained our land lawfully and that we should be able to organize into cooperatives to farm and to market our produce. We have to be allowed to form economically efficient units of production."

"As long as this question is unresolved, it will take a lot of guts to plant crops this year."

ARTHRITIS, DIABETES, AND DIGESTIVE DISEASES AMENDMENTS OF 1976

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, today I was joined by 11 other members of the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment in introducing the Arthritis, Diabetes, and Digestive Diseases Amendments of 1976.

The proposed legislation would revise and extend the program and authorizations of appropriations under title IV of the Public Health Service Act, relating

to arthritis, diabetes, and digestive diseases for 3 years through fiscal year 1980.

I am inserting herewith a summary of the background and an explanation of the proposed legislation:

BACKGROUND

ARTHRITIS

On January 4, 1975, the Arthritis Act of 1974 was enacted (P. L. 93-640). This law authorized programs of support for the development, modernization, and operation of centers for arthritis research, screening, detection, diagnosis, prevention, control, treatment, education and rehabilitation relating to arthritis. For support of arthritis centers, this law authorized to be appropriated \$11 million for FY 1975, \$13 million for FY 1976, and \$15 million for FY 1977. Subsequently, Title VI of P. L. 94-278 revised the authorization levels for FY 1976 and FY 1977 to read \$15 million and \$20 million, respectively. P. L. 94-278 also made a number of purely technical and clarifying amendments to the Arthritis Act.

The Arthritis Act of 1974 also authorized the establishment and support of demonstration projects for the development and demonstration of methods for arthritis, screening detection, prevention, and referral and for the dissemination of these methods to the health and allied health professions and directed the Secretary to establish the Arthritis Screening and Detection Data Bank for the collection, storage, analysis, retrieval and dissemination of certain data related to arthritis. For both of these purposes this law authorized to be appropriated \$2 million for FY 1975, \$3 million for FY 1976, and \$4 million for FY 1977.

In addition, the Arthritis Act directed the establishment of an Arthritis Coordinating Committee, composed of the representatives of the various Federal departments and agencies involved in research, health services, or rehabilitation programs affecting arthritis. This law directed the Committee to meet at least four times a year and to prepare an annual report detailing its work in seeking to improve coordination of departmental and interdepartmental activities relating to arthritis during the preceding year.

Lastly, the Arthritis Act of 1974, established the position of Associate Director of Arthritis and Related Musculoskeletal Diseases in the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases, and created the National Commission on Arthritis and Related Musculoskeletal Diseases to develop a long-range plan to combat arthritis and make its final report to Congress and the Secretary this year. Under section 16 of S. 2548, the Senate-passed EMS legislation, this Commission would cease to exist on December 3, 1976, if the provision is accepted by the House. For further reference see: sections 434, 437, 438, and 439 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 289c-1(b) and (e), 289c-4, 289c-5, and 289c-6); P. L. 93-640; and P. L. 94-278.

DIABETES

On July 23, 1974, the National Diabetes Mellitus Research and Education Act was enacted (P. L. 93-354). This law authorized programs of support for the development and expansion of centers for research and training in diabetes. For support of diabetes centers the law authorized to be appropriated \$8 million for FY 1975, \$12 million for FY 1976, and \$20 million for FY 1977.

In addition, this law directed the establishment of a Diabetes Mellitus Coordinating Committee, composed of representatives of the various Institutes in the National Institutes of Health and other Federal depart-

ments and agencies involved in research and other programs affecting diabetes. This law directed the Committee to prepare an annual report for the Director of NIH detailing its work in carrying out its activities in coordinating the diabetes activities of NIH and other Federal departments and agencies.

Lastly, the National Diabetes Mellitus Research Act established the position of Associate Director for Diabetes in the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases and created the National Commission on Diabetes to formulate a long-range plan to combat diabetes and make its final report to Congress this year. Under Title VII of P. L. 94-278, this Commission shall cease to exist after September 30, 1976. For further reference see: sections 434, 435, and 436 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 289c-1(d), 289c-2, and 289c-3); P. L. 93-354; and P. L. 94-278.

DIGESTIVE DISEASES

On May 19, 1972 legislation was enacted to designate the Research Institute on Arthritis, Rheumatism and Metabolic Diseases in NIH as the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases (P.L. 92-305). This law also established the position of Associate Director for Digestive Diseases and a committee within the NIAMDD Advisory Council to advise the Director of the Institute respecting the Institute's activities concerning digestive diseases and to review and make recommendations respecting applications for research projects concerning digestive diseases. In addition, this law authorized an intramural research program for digestive diseases and extramural programs for research and training in digestive diseases. For further reference see: section 434 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 289c-1(a) (b) and (c)); and P.L. 92-305.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation (Arthritis, Diabetes and Digestive Disease Amendments of 1976) would amend Title IV of the Public Health Service Act (hereinafter referred to as "the Act"), as follows:

TITLE I—ARTHRITIS AND RELATED MUSCULOSKELETAL DISEASES

1. Eliminates the function of arthritis "prevention" under section 438(a) of the Act for arthritis demonstration projects since the state-of-the-art in arthritis has not yet advanced enough to demonstrate "prevention".

2. Amends section 438(b) of the Act to require arthritis demonstration projects to include programs which emphasize the development and demonstration of new and improved methods of public education with respect to arthritis.

3. Revises section 438(c) of the Act to eliminate the requirement that an arthritis data bank be established and to require the establishment of an arthritis data system which is more technically and economically feasible.

4. Revises section 438(c) of the Act to broaden the scope of data that may be collected, stored, analyzed, retrieved and disseminated by the arthritis data system.

5. Separates the authorizations of appropriations for arthritis demonstration projects and the arthritis data system under section 438(d) of the Act; authorizes appropriations of \$3 million for FY 1978, \$4 million for FY 1979, and \$5 million for FY 1980 for arthritis demonstration projects and authorizes appropriations of \$1 million for FY 1978, \$1.25 million for FY 1979, and \$1.50 million for FY 1980 for the arthritis data system.

6. Requires arthritis centers, under section 439 of the Act, to conduct training programs for physicians and other health and allied professionals in arthritis research.

7. Revises the three-grant limitation for

arthritis centers under section 439(f) of the Act to permit support of a center for a period of not to exceed three years which can be extended for additional three-year periods by the Director of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases after review of the operations of a center by an appropriate scientific review group.

8. Extends the authorizations of appropriations for arthritis centers for three years at levels of \$18.7 million for FY 1978, \$19 million for FY 1979, and \$20 million for FY 1980.

9. Adds a new section 440 to the Act which requires the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to establish a 22-member, ongoing "National Arthritis Advisory Board" within 90 days after enactment.

10. Directs that the Board's "appointed" membership be composed of the following:

(a) Eight individuals who are scientists, physicians and other health professionals of which 3 shall be clinical rheumatologists, 2 shall be orthopedic surgeons, 2 shall be rheumatology investigators, and 1 shall be an allied health professional;

(b) Six individuals with an interest in arthritis who as a group have knowledge and experience in the fields of medical education, nursing, community program development, health education, data systems and public information;

(c) one individual who is also a member of the National Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases Advisory Council and who is an expert in arthritis; and

(d) four public members of which at least two shall be persons who have arthritis and one shall be the parent of a child who has arthritis.

11. Directs that the Board's ex-officio "nonvoting" membership be composed of the following persons, or their designees—

(a) the Assistant Secretary of Health;

(b) the Director of the National Institutes of Health; and

(c) the Associate Director of Arthritis of NIAMDD.

12. Requires the Board to review and evaluate the implementation of the Arthritis Plan formulated pursuant to the National Arthritis Act of 1974 and to advise and make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to such plan and the guidelines, policies, and procedures of Federal programs relating to arthritis.

13. Requires the Board to hold regular quarterly meetings.

14. Requires the Board to submit to the Secretary and the Congress (one year after its establishment and each year thereafter) a report which

(a) describes its activities for the year for which the report is made,

(b) summarizes expenditures made by the Federal government for arthritis for such year,

(c) describes and evaluates the progress made in such year in arthritis research, treatment, education, and training and

(d) which contains any recommendations by the Board for changes in the Arthritis Plan.

15. Requires the Secretary to provide the Board with such administrative support services and facilities, professional and clerical staff, information and the services of such consultants as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the Board in carrying out its duties.

16. Includes the customary provisions for the administration of the Board and for the compensation and expenses of Board members while in the performance of their duties and services as Board members.

17. Waives the two-year limit upon the duration of the existence of the Board to be

consistent with section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

18. Authorizes appropriations of \$100,000 for FY 1978 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the next two fiscal years for the Board.

TITLE II—DIABETES

1. Directs the Secretary, within 90 days after the date of enactment to establish a 19-member, ongoing National Diabetes Advisory Board.

2. Requires that the Board be composed of the following ex-officio members or their designees:

(a) the Assistant Secretary for Health,
(b) the Director of the National Institutes of Health,

(c) the Director of the National Institutes of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases,

(d) the Director of the Center for Disease Control,

(e) the Administrator of the Health Services Administration,

(f) the Administrator of the Health Resources Administration and

(g) the Associate Director for Diabetes of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases.

3. Permits ex-officio members of the Board to vote on matters before the Board meetings but prohibits designees of such members from voting on Board matters.

4. Requires that the Board be composed of the following members appointed by the Secretary:

(a) seven individuals who are health and allied health professionals or scientists representing the various specialties and disciplines involved with diabetes mellitus and related endocrine and metabolic diseases, and

(b) five members from the general public of which at least one shall be a person with diabetes and two shall be persons who are each a parent of a diabetic child.

5. Requires the Secretary to provide the Board with an executive director, assistant director and with such administrative support services and facilities, additional professional and clerical staff, information, and the services of such consultants as the Secretary determines is necessary for the Board to carry out its functions.

6. Requires the Secretary to consult with and consider the recommendations of the Board with respect to staff, contracts, and other arrangements for the Board.

7. Requires the Board to review, evaluate and advise with respect to the "Diabetes Plan" formulated by the National Commission on Diabetes under the National Diabetes Mellitus Research and Education Act and to recommend additional measures and legislative proposals it finds necessary for the successful implementation of the long-range plan to combat diabetes and the most effective utilization and organization of national diabetes resources.

8. Requires the Commission to:

(a) conduct a comprehensive study of the present state of knowledge of the incidence, duration, morbidity, and social and economic impact of digestive diseases,

(b) evaluate public and private facilities and resources for the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of, and research in, such diseases,

(c) identify programs in which, and the means by which, improvement in the management of digestive diseases can be accomplished, and

(d) develop and recommend a long-range plan for the use and organization of national resources to effectively deal with digestive diseases based upon the study, evaluation, and identification made pursuant to (a), (b) and (c).

9. Requires Federal entities administering health programs and activities related to digestive diseases to assist the Commission in making its study, evaluation and identification.

10. Specifies in detail the elements which the long-range plan respecting digestive diseases, must encompass.

11. Requires the Commission to recommend the estimated expenditures necessary for each of the Institutes within the National Institutes of Health to carry out its activities related to digestive diseases.

12. Require the Commission to publish and transmit directly to Congress a final report within 18 months after its first meeting and requires the report to contain:

(a) the long-range plan respecting digestive diseases;

(b) the expenditure estimates for digestive diseases activities by each of the Institutes within the National Institutes of Health and

(c) any recommendations of the Commission for legislation.

13. Provides that the Commission will cease to exist on the 30th day following the date of submission of its final report to Congress.

14. Includes other customary provisions for the administration of the Commission and for the compensation and expenses of the Commission members while in the performance of their duties and services as Commission members.

15. Authorizes appropriations of \$1,500,000 for the purposes of carrying out the activities of the Commission.

16. Provides for a new section 440A of the Act which requires the Secretary to establish a Coordinating Committee for Digestive Diseases to be composed of the following members or their designated representatives:

(a) the Directors of each of the Institutes of the National Institutes of Health involved in digestive disease research.

TITLE III—DIGESTIVE DISEASES

1. Directs the Secretary, within 60 days after enactment, to establish a 23-member National Commission on Digestive Diseases.

2. Directs that the Commission's appointed membership be composed of the following:

(a) ten individuals who are scientists, physicians, and other health professionals of which two shall be gastroenterologists, one shall be a surgeon, one shall be an expert in liver disease, one shall be an epidemiologist, one shall be an allied health professional and two shall be basic biomedical scientists,

(b) four members from the general public of whom at least two shall have personal or close family experience with digestive diseases, and

(c) one member of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases Advisory Council whose primary interest is in the field of digestive diseases.

3. Designates as ex-officio members of the Commission the following or their designees:

(a) the Director of the National Institutes of Health,

(b) the Director of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases,

(c) the Directors of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, the National Cancer Institute and the National Institute of General Medical Sciences,

(d) the Associate Director for Digestive Diseases and Nutrition of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases,

(e) the Director of the Center for Disease Control, and

(f) the Chief Medical Officer of the Veterans' Administration.

4. Requires the Commission to meet at least three times and at the call of its chairperson who must be an appointed member of the Commission and who is selected by the members of the Commission.

5. Authorizes the Commission to hold hearings, take testimony, and sit and act at such time and places as it deems advisable.

6. Authorizes the Commission to appoint and fix the pay of an executive secretary, consistent with Federal laws and regulations governing such competitive appointments and public employee compensation.

7. Requires the Secretary to provide the Commission with such additional professional and clerical staff, such information, and the services of such consultants as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the Commission to carry out its functions effectively.

8. Authorizes the Board to collect data and conduct or sponsor conferences, workshops and related activities and to establish working committees composed of Board members and non-member consultants as it deems advisable and necessary to carry out its functions.

9. Requires the Board to hold regular quarterly meetings and to submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report which:

(a) describes the Board activities for the prior year,

(b) describes and evaluates the progress made during such year in diabetes research, treatment, and education with reference to the long-range diabetes plan,

(c) describes the Board's proposed activities for the next year,

(d) includes an analysis of current expenditures and suggests recommended expenditures for the forthcoming fiscal year for diabetes related activities of the Federal government, and

(e) discusses recommended changes in the long-range plan to combat diabetes mellitus necessitated by developments in the field.

10. Waives the two-year limit upon the duration of the existence of the Board to be consistent with section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

11. Authorizes to be appropriated \$500,000 for FY 1978 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the next two fiscal years for the Board to carry out its functions and activities.

12. Includes other customary provisions for the administration of the Board and for the compensation and expenses of Board members while in the performance of their duties and services as Board members.

13. Extends the authorizations of appropriations for diabetes research and training centers, under section 435 of the Act, for three fiscal years and authorizes \$12 million for fiscal year 1978, \$20 million for FY 1979, and \$20 million for FY 1980 for this purpose.

(a) the head of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration,

(b) the head of the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health,

(c) the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration,

(d) the head of the Veterans' Administration,

(e) the head of the Center for Disease Control,

(f) the head of the Department of Defense,

(g) the head of the Department of Agriculture,

(h) the head of the Health Services Administration,

(i) the head of the Health Resources Administration,

(j) the head of the Social Security Administration, and

(k) the head of the National Research Council of the National Institute of Medicine.

17. Provides that the Coordinating Committee shall be chaired by the Director of

the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases and that the Associate Director for Digestive Diseases and Nutrition shall serve as vice-chairman.

18. Requires the Coordinating Committee to meet at the call of the Chairman and not less than three times a year.

19. Requires the Coordinating Committee to be responsible for the coordination of the activities of the entities represented on the Committee respecting digestive diseases.

20. Requires the Coordinating Committee to submit to the Secretary an annual report detailing its activities.

GUN CONTROL: GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE IN THE MARKET-PLACE

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, recently the Washington newspaper, Newsweek, featured an article on gun control that is unusual in its approach. Beginning with the premise that gun control is in fact an interference by the Government in the free market, the article asks the question, "Who stands to benefit from such an interference?" And the answer, unsurprisingly enough, comes back clearly: the big gun manufacturers. Just as the 1968 gun control law reduced competition for the gun manufacturers by outlawing the mail order sale of guns, so the current gun control proposals would further eliminate the competition for the major gun manufacturers by outlawing the so-called "Saturday Night Specials," that is, the inexpensive handguns that the poor people can afford. As gun control laws become more restrictive, the price of both legal and illegal guns increases, and the ones who will benefit from that are the manufacturers of guns and the blackmarketeers who defy the law and sell them.

The article follows:

FOLLOW THE MONEY: THE REAL BIG GUNS BEHIND GUN CONTROL

(By John Aquilino)

The Great American Gun Control Debate is perhaps the first issue since Vietnam to polarize the nation into two hostile camps, with each claiming a lock on God, country and right reason.

On one side are the pro-gunners, who see the movement afoot to disarm America as a fundamental threat to the Constitution and the Rights of Man. They are portrayed in the anti-gun press as beer-swilling, potbellied Bambi-killers with little more brain matter than a slightly rotted potato.

On the other side are the anti-gunners, who number among their ranks the Eastern liberal press, CBS, nearly every bearer of a Harvard law degree, Cleveland Amory, Mary Tyler Moore, and Robert Redford.

Both sides agree that the nation must rid itself of crime. But neither agrees on how that is to be done. Meanwhile, certain members of Congress are offering National Handgun Control legislation as an instant antidote.

But is it? In fact, just what effect will national handgun legislation have?

A close examination of the Federal Firearms Act of 1976, now pending before the House Subcommittee on Crime, shows that one measurable impact it and similar bills will have is the elimination of some 30 or 34 firearms manufacturers—and a consider-

able purse-fattening of the remaining four. In short, the real beneficiary of this particular bit of federal legislation is Big Business—which means the Big Four handgun manufacturers—Colt, Smith & Wesson, Sturm-Ruger, and High Standard.

Colt Firearms, which accounts for but five percent of Colt Industries' revenues, is a 71-million-dollar-a-year business. Colt's firearms production is divided 50-50 between military and non-military markets. And its non-military market is further subdivided into the sporting market and police markets. Just how Colt's non-military business breaks down between the two is not possible to determine. But it's an accepted rule of thumb that most law enforcement agencies in this country issue either Colt or Smith & Wesson sidearms.

Smith & Wesson, like Colt, is no slouch when it comes to making bucks. A subsidiary of the Bangor-Punta conglomerate, Smith & Wesson does 66 million dollars' worth of business annually. It claims 25 percent of its handguns are shipped overseas, while 48 of the nation's 50 state police departments pack Smith & Wesson revolvers.

Sturm-Ruger, owned largely by the Ruger family, is a 34-million-dollar business that also sells handguns and carbines to the military and police both here and abroad.

(On High Standard, the fourth big gunmaker, information was not available.)

Among themselves the Big Four control between 55 and 70 percent of the domestic non-police, non-military handgun market.

Since the Gun Control Act of 1968, the trend in anti-gun legislation has been toward the gradual elimination of privately owned guns. And despite protestations of the gun lobby to the contrary, the next step on both the local and federal levels will be an outright ban and confiscation of handguns. (Already the staff of the House Subcommittee on Crime has devised a two-year income-tax-break plan for reimbursing the public for its firearms confiscated under future legislation. It is estimated that the payback scheme, incidentally, would cost Uncle Sam some two-and-a-half to three billion dollars.)

The effect of this incremental elimination on the firearms industry is simple: the majors would be in, the independents out.

Under its present form—that is, free from the highly controversial Russo Amendment, which would have banned as "Saturday Night Specials" some 75 percent of all handguns (including Dirty Harry's gargantuan 14-inch .44 magnum Smith & Wesson hand cannon)—the Federal Firearms Act of 1976 (H.R. 11193) now before the House is perfectly acceptable to the major handgun manufacturers. Their few handguns affected would need only different barrels or slight retooling. And the revised Saturday Night Special proviso "would not have any effect on us because we don't make that type of gun," said Colt's Public Relations Vice President, John Campbell. It likewise will have little effect on Smith & Wesson, Sturm-Ruger, or High Standard. But H.R. 11193's effect on the rest of the industry would be devastating. Most small manufacturers would lose from 50 to 100 percent of their product line.

In short, "we'd be out of business," said James Bowers of Bowers Firearms. So, too, would be Dan Wesson, Sterling Arms, Charter Arms, and so on down the line.

Since they've nothing to lose and everything to gain, it stands to reason the Big Four would push for "acceptable" Saturday Night Special laws. And push they have.

During the final days of eight months of hearings on gun control held by the House Subcommittee on Crime, Ronald Gainer, acting director of the Department of Justice's Office of Planning and Policy, had an interesting exchange with the chairman, John Conyers, Jr. (D-Mich.).

Conyers asked Gainer if the "reputable" gun manufacturers—Colt, Smith & Wesson, Sturm-Ruger and High Standard—were "in

on" formulation of the legislation (HR 9022) then under discussion. Gainer said he had met with representatives of these companies. He said the discussions were at the companies' request and that they had "indicated a great willingness to assist the Department of the Treasury in attempting to define what is meant by that colloquialism (*Saturday Night Special*)."

Another interesting bit of voluntary cooperation between the major manufacturers and federal folk had occurred six months earlier.

In April 1975, Conyers' House Subcommittee on Crime sent letters of inquiry to the country's 34 federally licensed handgun manufacturers. The letter asked 21 questions on production details the Subcommittee felt would be helpful in "its evaluation of existing law."

On the surface, such action appears innocent enough. After all, in 1972 the Subcommittee then chaired by Emanuel Celler had sent virtually the same letter. This time, however, certain embellishments in it raised the hackles of the majority of independent manufacturers even more. First, the information sought was highly confidential (as it was in 1972); any leaks to competitors "would play hell with my business" as one independent firm's spokesman put it. And according to Timothy Hart of Conyers' Subcommittee, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms (ATF) agreed with the manufacturers. The Subcommittee had originally sought the information from ATF but was told such data, supplied to ATF on a voluntary basis by the manufacturers, constituted "Industrial Intelligence" and therefore could not be released.

Hart and the Subcommittee claimed quite the opposite. But the Subcommittee "decided to go to the manufacturers rather than fight" ATF over the matter. Hart said the Subcommittee could have obtained the ATF statistics but that it would have meant going to Conyers for a "signed opinion"—a formality Hart characterized as "nonsense."

After 23 companies balked at detailing specifics of their businesses, they received two follow-up letters—one from Conyers' Subcommittee and one from the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers Institute (SAAMI). The Conyers letter informed the reluctant manufacturers that their names had been forwarded to federal investigators to determine if they were in violation of the 1968 Gun Control Act. The SAAMI letter contained a copy of Conyers' first letter (in case the manufacturers' copy had been lost in the mail) and urged full cooperation with the Conyers Subcommittee. It closed with the statement, "For SAAMI, and its member-companies that have already submitted the information asked of them, I can only add that it seems a matter of prudence and good judgment serving the broadest interests of an (sic) industry to cooperate. . ."

What's more interesting about the SAAMI letter is that SAAMI is the trade association of the major firearms manufacturers in the nation; members include Colt, Sturm, Ruger, and High Standard as well as the big long-gun makers such as Remington, Winchester, and Savage.

Of course, no one would dare suggest that such reputable firms might have ulterior motives behind their eagerness to aid the federal lawsmiths.

No one, that is, who is unfamiliar with the evolution of the Gun Control Act of 1968.

Prior to 1963 and the assassination of John Kennedy, the American firearms industry, including both long gun and handgun manufacturers, tried no less than twelve times to freeze out military-surplus importers, mail-order distributors, and foreign manufacturers whose guns were cheaper (in price, not in quality). They had already tried claiming economic hardship; this was doomed as too

honest an approach. They had tried claiming the gun-control legislation was needed for national defense; this was an excuse so lame that even the gun industry's main man in Congress, then-Senator Tom Dodd of Connecticut, couldn't peddle it with a straight face.

Then, in 1963, as Robert Sherrill points out in his book *Saturday Night Special*, New England's gunmakers and Congress discovered crime—but not, curiously enough, "until they needed it."

The year 1963 was the year crime was first linked with efforts to gain more restrictive federal gun legislation. Such legislation was to be "restrictive" only in the sense of preserving the American market in both long guns and handguns for American manufacturers.

Crime, coupled with the rash of political assassinations that seemed to be the national pastime from 1963 to 1968, proved just the ticket the gun industry needed. Within weeks of the assassinations of RFK and Martin Luther King, Jr., the Gun Control Act of 1968 was rushed into law and the American firearms industry sat fat, happy, and protected against bothersome competition.

A year later, Winchester-Western Vice President W. E. Talley was quoted as saying, "Elimination of mail-order sales as we know them and the restriction that ammunition and firearms must be sold only by licensed dealers increases the dealers' share of the market considerably."

"In addition to this, the drying up of the military-surplus market will permit the local dealer to capture this market with new merchandise at better profit levels."

The effect of gun control on the American handgun industry might be tolerated if, and only if, such legislation actually proved effective in stemming the tide of crime. But two recent studies involving England's half-century without guns, Switzerland's national fascination with guns, and America's decade of experimenting with its version of gun control, as a panacea to the nation's crime problem, is indeed a cruel hoax conjured by the gun industry, evangelized by unscrupulous or just plain dumb politicians, and perpetrated by a careless press. The studies, one by the University of Wisconsin and one by Cambridge University, concluded that peaceful societies do not need anti-handgun legislation, and violent societies (like the US) do not benefit from gun control at all. The Wisconsin study went on to say, "Gun control laws have no individual or collective effect in reducing the rate of violent crime."

Likewise the contention that, since most murders are spontaneous passion slayings of friends or loved ones, ridding private citizens of handguns would reduce the murder rate falls flat, upon close scrutiny. A "gun murder profile" puzzled together by the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency from 125 biographies of DC murder defendants sheds a little more light on the matter. Granted that 81 percent of the victims were "wives or relatives or friends", and that of that number, 88 percent were killed during a lovers' quarrel or drunken brawl. But in nearly all cases, the murderer "had been piling up a criminal record for ten years," including previous arrests for serious crimes and crimes of violence—hardly your average law-abiding citizen. Further, the study points out the findings in DC were consistent with similar statistics for 120 other US cities.

Still, regardless of whether HR 11193 passes the next session of Congress, the Big Four handgun manufacturers will survive handily. If the 1968 act remains the law of the land, they will maintain their command over the "civilian" market. If HR 11193 becomes law, they will fall heir to the entire civilian market. And if, as is being predicted, in ten years private ownership of handguns is outlawed, at least three of the Big Four will still be

around merrily filling orders for the military, police, and foreign export markets they now monopolize.

What's most interesting about the (intentionally or accidentally) federally orchestrated consolidation of the American handgun industry is that the small manufacturers recognize what's happening, yet refuse to believe it.

Said James Bowers, President of Bowers Firearms, "Perhaps I'm just overly naive. I don't think they (the federal government and the major manufacturers) would do that. I would hate to think that way." NW

LIMITING SST POLLUTION EMISSIONS

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, on August 16, 1976, Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, Administrator Russell E. Train promulgated standards for the emission of air pollutants from supersonic, SST, aircraft. In a press release issued on that date EPA stated:

The new emission levels will still be about four times higher than comparable subsonic engines meeting EPA standards in 1980.

Such emission levels are unacceptable, especially to those who live in and around airports which will be servicing SST's.

Accordingly, I have redrafted my amendment to section 206 which I previously published in the RECORD. My new amendment while substantially the same as the old one would require the promulgation of SST emission standards based on certain criteria. The test of the amendment follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 10498, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MR. SCHEUER

Page 278, strike out line 6 and all that follows down through line 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(4) In the case of nonmilitary supersonic aircraft or nonmilitary supersonic aircraft engines manufactured before January 1, 1979, regulations under this section shall contain emission standards which reflect the degree of emission limitation achievable through the application of the best system of emission reduction which the Administrator determines to be available upon the effective date of such standards. In the case of any such aircraft or engine manufactured on or after January 1, 1979, such regulations shall contain emission standards which require a level of emission reduction for each air pollutant which is no less stringent than the level permitted under the least stringent standard for such pollutant applicable to any class or category of subsonic aircraft or aircraft engines. Any regulations under this section applicable to nonmilitary supersonic aircraft or nonmilitary supersonic aircraft engines which were promulgated before the date of enactment of this paragraph shall be revised (after fulfillment of the procedural requirements contained in paragraph (3)) in accordance with the requirements of this paragraph. Such revised regulations shall take effect not later than the date 6 months after the date of enactment of this paragraph.

Page 278, after line 13, insert:

(c) Section 232 of such Act is amended by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(c) No certificate referred to in this section may be issued to any nonmilitary supersonic aircraft or aircraft engine manufactured on or after January 1, 1979, unless the Administrator determines that such aircraft or engine complies with applicable emission standards without an increase in the noise level above the noise level which such aircraft or engine would exhibit but for the application of such standards.

"(d) Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect or impair any right, privilege, or authority respecting air pollution which may be exercised under State or local law by the owner or operator of any airport or airport facility."

(d) Upon the date 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation may not permit any nonmilitary supersonic aircraft to land in the United States unless such aircraft has been certified by the Secretary to be in compliance with the emission standards promulgated as required in section 231(a)(4) of the Clean Air Act.

TRIBUTE TO STEVE SHEPPARD— OLYMPIC CHAMPION

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I pay tribute to an outstanding young man from the Bronx, Steve Sheppard, who was a member of the gold medal winning U.S. basketball team, which competed in the summer Olympic games.

Certainly, the performances turned in by our basketball team had to be considered the highlight of an overall successful Olympics for the American athletes. The American basketball team, under the able tutelage of Dean Smith from the University of North Carolina, knew they were a talented squad, but also knew they would have to play together as a team if they were to get by their tough opponents. This they did, and were able to beat Italy, Czechoslovakia, Puerto Rico, and ultimately a strong Yugoslavian team to capture the gold medal.

Steve Sheppard's contribution to the team was two-fold in nature. In addition to his fine playing, his enthusiasm while on the bench also helped the team immeasurably. This contribution should not be overlooked for while many of the players on the Olympic basketball team are accustomed to being starters on their own teams, the wealth of talent can sometimes relegate an outstanding player to the role of a substitute. The mark of a champion is one who accepts this role, plays to his best capabilities when he does play, and provides support to his fellow players when not playing. This was Steve Sheppard.

For Steve, being on an Olympic gold medal team while still a junior in college must have been a thrill. He now looks forward to completing an outstanding basketball career as a starting forward for the University of Maryland basketball team, which has been ranked in the top 10 for most of the time that Steve has played with them. Capturing a na-

tional championship is Steve Sheppard's next goal, and all who know or have seen Steve on the court, realize his goal may be achieved this year.

Steve's family, friends, and teammates at Maryland are all proud of his accomplishments. His community helped express their sentiments when a Community Committee to Honor Steve Sheppard, led by Dorothy Stovall and Sarah Townsend, held "A Salute to Steve Sheppard Day" on August 21. I am proud to join with Steve's many friends and fans in congratulating him for an outstanding achievement and extend to him, my best wishes for continued success in the future.

COMPENSATING VICTIMS OF CRIME

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the problems of crime and its victims, the following article from McCall's September 1976, may prove helpful:

COMPENSATING VICTIMS OF CRIME (By Ann O'Shea)

Thousands of people are injured or killed every day in violent crimes in this country, according to FBI estimates. Some are the actual victims of robberies, assaults, rapes and homicides; some are bystanders or Good Samaritans attempting to stop a crime in progress. Not only must these innocent people and their families endure the trauma of the crime, but they often end up paying for all or part of the medical—or funeral—expenses incurred as a result of the crime.

In an attempt to ease this financial burden, 16 states (Alaska, California, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Virginia and Washington) have Crime Victims' Compensation Boards. These are supposed to reimburse victims—or their dependents—for any expense or lost income that is uncollectable from any other source and is a direct result of the crime. However, most of these state programs are woefully underfunded and understaffed. There is just not enough money in the state treasuries to pay all the victims who qualify or to staff the compensation offices adequately. The New Jersey Compensation Board, for example, averaged about 43 claims a month until an advertising campaign to make people aware of the board more than doubled that figure. Now the Newark office alone receives about 120 claims each month, 40 of which the small staff is able to process. The rest join the growing backlog.

"It's clear that the federal government has got to assist the states in caring for the victims of crime," says Carl Jahnke, Co-Chairman of the International Association of Crime Victim Compensation Boards. "All of our [federal] criminal-justice programs are offender-oriented, and the funds for these programs come from the pockets of taxpayers—among them the victims themselves who should be entitled to some of this money."

According to Justice Department figures, \$15 billion was spent on criminal justice in 1974—more than 97 percent of which went to offender-oriented activities, which, according to Mr. Jahnke, "don't deter, prevent or rehabilitate criminals. I'm not suggesting

that we stop trying to rehabilitate criminals," he explains. "I'm only saying that if these programs can fail for fifteen billion dollars, why can't they fail for fourteen billion dollars, so we can allocate the difference to programs that aid victims."

A bill (H.R. 13158) that would supply federal grants to states with victim compensation boards is currently before Congress. It would provide \$40 million to such states in 1977, \$50 million in 1978 and \$60 million in the third year, 1979, after which the programs would be reviewed. If your state does not have a Crime Victims' Compensation Board, you can write your state representatives to ask for one. To support H.R. 13158, write your congressional representatives.

VFW 77TH NATIONAL CONVENTION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on August 16, I had the honor and pleasure to attend the 77th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at the New York Hilton in New York City. On that occasion, 12,000 delegates registered and 40,000 people attended—truly a remarkable showing.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars have been highly effective in gaining and protecting the rights and welfare of this country's veterans. In addition, the VFW has always been extremely active in community affairs, enhancing the quality of life in thousands of towns and cities spread across the entire Nation. Through their dedication and patriotism, these veterans have made significant contributions to the United States in the difficult and trying times of peace as well as war, and their annual convention is certainly a proud occasion, indeed.

As many of my colleagues are aware, the purpose of this annual convention is to guide the organization for the coming year, through mandates which are resolutions adopted by the delegates.

The VFW also elects its national officers, and at the 77th Convention, R. D. "Bulldog" Smith of Atlanta, Ga., was voted to be Commander-in-Chief for 1976-77.

Former Secretary of Defense Dr. James R. Schlesinger was presented with the Dwight David Eisenhower Award at the Distinguished Guests Banquet, where he delivered the following speech. His remarks concern the defense posture of this country and the need to build mutual security and to emphasize the distinctive American values and freedoms which represent the foundation of our strength. I insert this address in the Record and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY JAMES R. SCHLESINGER BEFORE THE 77TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

I deeply appreciate both the opportunity to be with you at the 77th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the signal honor you have done me through presentation of the Dwight David Eisenhower Award.

The course of Dwight Eisenhower's life from Dennison, Texas and Abilene, Kansas to Supreme Allied Commander and ultimately to preeminent world leader symbolizes so remarkably well the change in America's role and America's responsibility. Eisenhower personified the emergence of the United States from the backwaters of international politics to center stage in a new world in which the survival of freedom, of national independence, and of diversity depended on the continued strength of the United States. Not only did he represent the graceful acceptance of this altered concept of America's role, but in his person he became the very symbol of the concept of mutual security—the understanding that the democracies of this world must hang together in the protection of their common interests and aspirations, that our liberties depend upon other nations just as their survival depends upon us. He recognized that the most immediate threat to the United States was the indirect one overseas, thus providing a new dimension to Ben Franklin's oft-quoted jest:

"We must all hang together or we will assuredly all hang separately."

Your selection of your former commander and former Commander-in-Chief for this honored role, it should be underscored, speaks abundantly of the parallel development and parallel beliefs etched in the history of your organization. Tracing back to the first tentative emergence of the United States on the world scene in the Spanish American War, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has reflected the expanding role of the United States in the Twentieth Century as the principal guardian of freedom and the barrier to totalitarian ambitions. The Veterans of Foreign Wars require no lessons to persuade them of the need to neutralize external threats overseas before they arrive on American shores. You understand the necessity for the prudent use of America's power. From participating in coalition wars in the past, you fully understand the need for mutual security, just as did General Eisenhower. To keep hostile forces from American shores—an awareness strongly reinforced by some events recalled during this Bicentennial Year—is indispensable but it is not sufficient. In this shrunken world we must also have allies and sympathetic states overseas—to insure a world environment in which our social order can flourish. Not for you the easy temptation of neoisolationism. The physical defense of North America can start at the water's edge or the mid-Pacific, but the security of this nation also remains overseas. The Veterans of Foreign Wars understand in their very bones that if we are unprepared to help defend places other than North America, we shall soon enough have nothing but North America to defend.

Given a challenge that will continue as far as we can see into our Third Century, how well prepared is our nation to cope with the arduous task ahead? How fares this great Republic? The report is brief and encouraging: her health is returning; her vision is improving. From a low point of discontent, reflecting the divisiveness of the Vietnam War, the internal divisions, and domestic political travail, one can distinctly see a change in the national mood. All about one can see the signs, some tentative, of the restoration of the national spirit. Indeed this is a volatile nation—a cause of concern abroad, but very much a part of our national strength. Once again the American people have demonstrated, to the surprise of some, that ours remains the most resilient nation on earth.

Yet, having recovered our equilibrium, how well have we addressed ourselves to the fulfillment of the tasks at hand? Here, the uncertainties are greater; the verdict must be

postponed. How deep is our understanding of the complex requirements for our defense and foreign policies—and how firmly will we demonstrate our determination to accomplish the tasks before us? Let me examine these fundamental questions in some detail.

First, let me address the all-important question of the nation's defenses. For in a world to a remarkable degree still militarily bipolar, the United States inescapably remains the only available counterweight to the steadily growing military power of the Soviet Union. We remain the indispensable source of strength to sustain other free nations. We must provide that supplemental margin of power that permits the survival of independent nations adjacent to the main power of the Soviet state. Yet, we cannot and should not be required to shoulder an undue share of the total responsibility. Vigorous action by our allies, more vigorous than has been shown to date, is also indispensable in order to maintain the military balance. Our allies must recognize that American power is no longer preeminent—and therefore they must shoulder additional responsibility. We must continue to pool our collective strength.

Through strength lie effective deterrence and the preservation of peace. The critics of America's military strength, now happily diminishing in number, have failed to grasp that fundamental point. It is weakness that invites the pressures which lead to war—or to retreat. Strength is indispensable for effective deterrence.

Effective deterrence does not come from pious hopes or wishful thinking or "too little and too late." Instead it comes from a carefully conceived strategy for responding to clear threats or provocation. To deter, a strategy must be one that can be successfully executed—and visibly so to a potential foe. A posture which is a mixture of an accumulation of divers weapons and of ill-formed plans and aspirations need not successfully deter.

In brief, three elements are indispensable for effective deterrence. First, a compelling strategy, recognizably so to a potential foe. Second, the forces necessary to back up that strategy, deployed so it could be successfully implemented. Third, the resources and logistical support necessary to sustain those forces. Each represents a leg of a stool, and without all three legs, the stool will not stand.

Those who would risk deterrence on a strategy that cannot be implemented or who refuse to provide and deploy the forces necessary to underwrite an adequate strategy, one should observe ironically, may be the true warmongers. Deterrence cannot be based on wishful thinking. It requires the strategy and forces to provide for effective response. Without those ingredients, we run the risk of generating more veterans of foreign wars.

In the critical processes of planning and budgeting for the forces to underwrite our strategies, how well have we fared? General Eisenhower emphasized the need to avoid feast or famine and to develop a plan for the long haul. The need to take the long view has historically been a weak point in our defense budgeting. The Armed Forces should have a plan that they can execute. Regrettably the tendency has been one of repeated intervention that precludes the execution of such a plan. It has resulted in stops and starts—that run up costs, and serve no visible purpose. Defense planning should not be a political football. If defense is blown thither and yon with each shift of the political wind, it is the Nation's security that suffers as much as the Armed Forces.

In the past year we have seen some improvement. The Administration, inclined just last November severely to cut back its own Five-Year Defense Plan, happily reversed it-

self. The Congress has displayed far greater understanding and judgment in its handling of appropriations requests. There is a greater understanding of the need for, and the financial requirements of, maintaining force readiness. Moreover, it is now widely understood that forces deployed overseas contribute to deterrence in a way that forces stationed in the United States cannot.

Yet, misunderstanding continues regarding the elements of a credible strategy. Those who express misgivings, correctly in my judgment, regarding a strategy unduly dependent on nuclear threats—too frequently turn out to be the very ones who urge budget slashes and the reduction of our conventional forces. This is illogical. It represents an astonishing gap between a nominally preferred strategy—and the forces necessary to underwrite it.

Yet, it remains altogether too commonplace. The only way to reduce dependence on nuclear threats, to keep the nuclear threshold high, is to maintain the conventional forces that provide suitable options for the policymakers—and reduce the likelihood of our positions being tested.

Thus, the answer to the question—how well are we faring?—is that we see clear signs of improvement, yet serious deficiencies remain.

Let me turn now to the subject of detente. The close connection of detente with defense is best suggested by the widespread though mistaken belief that somehow or other detente is a substitute for defense. For many in the West there has been an illusion that detente eliminated the possibility of conflict, and, consequently, we were free to disarm. That is almost the reverse of reality. Whatever the prospects for detente, they rest on the maintenance of an equilibrium of force, the retention of adequate deterrence structures.

The Soviets understand this full well. Repeatedly, they have asserted that detente is the consequence of the growing military power of the Soviet Union—to which the West has been forced to make accommodation. And they believe that detente will be a continuing process marking the shift of the so-called "correlation of forces" in favor of the Soviet Union and against the West. Obviously, it is a prescription that we cannot afford to accept. But it does underscore the Soviet view that detente is a reflection of rather than a substitute for the balance of power. From it we must necessarily draw the correct conclusions regarding the maintenance of our own defenses—and reject the false hopes of the earlier years of this decade.

For the Soviets, detente has meant only the renunciation of the doctrine of the inevitability of war. It has not meant that they have renounced their belief in the inevitable triumph of their own form of social order. They have specifically rejected that detente means acceptance of the status quo. Chairman Brezhnev has recently reiterated that detente in no way repeals the laws of class warfare. Nor does it mean an end to the global struggle against imperialism. It is only in the minds of Westerners that detente has ever connoted genuine reconciliation.

Here in America we need a better understanding of these sharply contrasting interpretations of detente. Ironically, it will both improve international understanding, as well as permit us to protect ourselves with fewer disappointments. For the Soviets peaceful coexistence means nothing in the way of real accommodation; it means only that the superpowers need not reach a direct military clash. When the Soviets denounce those in the West whom they describe as anti-detente, it may be largely for purposes of propaganda. Yet, it is not only propaganda. From their standpoint—viewed through the highly distorted filter of Marxist-Leninist theory—being anti-detente implies acceptance of the

likelihood, if not the inevitability, of major armed conflict. So, given their peculiar party doctrines, one can understand that there is genuine concern.

The American view is entirely different. Criticism of the Soviet interpretation of armed conflict—irrespective of the twists and turns of Communist Party logic. We, of course, are prepared to accept "peaceful coexistence," if that is all that can be attained. But we must be under no illusion; we must accept this framework with a full understanding of Soviet attitudes and Soviet tactics. And we should understand that the Soviet interpretation of "peaceful coexistence" is almost identical to what we formerly called the "cold war." It implies a continuing struggle between the two social orders; it implies a rejection of the status quo; it implies support by the Soviets of wars of national liberation; and it implies the legitimacy of Soviet attempts to undermine or subvert Western-oriented governments.

The Soviets have been remarkably candid about these attitudes. It is only we in the West who have been inclined to delude ourselves by our hopes rather than the realities. While we in the West have tried to achieve through détente the relaxation of tension, the Soviets have persistently stated that détente requires an intensification of the ideological conflict. Intensification of the ideological struggle does not sound much like the relaxation of tension.

We have been ill prepared to cope with the ideological conflict, barely recognizing its existence. The consequence has been something like a unilateral suspension of the ideological conflict. The Soviets are prepared to use rough tactics to expand their influence; we throw up our hands in consternation. When taxed with our disappointment in their behavior, the Soviets quite bluntly point out that it is our view of détente as "live and let live" which is in error. It would be better, they suggest, to drop our term "détente" and adopt their term "peaceful coexistence"—so that there might be less misunderstanding. In any event, in our negotiations as well as in determining our defense policy—we should take them at their word. They are deadly serious.

Yet, we must not draw the conclusion that negotiations are useless. As the enlightened party in the continuing conflict, we must retain hope both that negotiations can provide concrete results and that ultimately Soviet attitudes will change. But for us, negotiations must be based upon full comprehension of Soviet beliefs and Soviet tactics. For the Soviets, negotiations are but another instrument in the continuing conflict. In no way do they accept a shared goal or a joint interest in achieving international stability. They will bargain hard, always seeking those marginal advantages, which they renounced on paper in 1972.

It is our moral obligation to negotiate, but we are under no obligation to accept bad agreements in order to "preserve" détente. We are ill advised, if we set deadlines for agreements, first, because the Soviets will regard it as a sign of undue eagerness and of weakness on our part, and second, because, tactically speaking, the Soviets have repeatedly indicated that the great gains are made in the final stages of negotiations—in the "last twenty minutes," as they say. We are also ill advised, if we believe that unrequited concessions will elicit goodwill. For the Soviets, eagerness to please is but a sign of weakness to be exploited. For our part, we should recognize that the Soviets value negotiations as much for tactical advantages in the ideological struggle as for their content.

Earlier I spoke of the change in the national mood in the recent past, of the clear

signs of the restoration of the national spirit, of the resiliency of this nation. All of this is true and is reflected in the national mood. But I fear there continues to be one deficiency, one missing element, and it is related to what the Soviets call the ideological struggle. We need more than an absence of internal tension; we need an affirmative vision. The lack reflects an insufficient awareness of the distinctiveness of our nation, of the positive values that give meaning to our national life. Our long-term strength is intimately bound up with the appreciation of our distinctive values—the stress on individual freedom, on civil and religious liberty, and on the pursuit of truth. They must not be blurred. They remain the ultimate source of our national strength. Some three hundred years ago, John Milton wrote in his "Areopagitica":

"Give me liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberty."

In that statement Milton framed the ultimate belief of our Western Civilization. It is this belief that distinguishes our nation and other free states from the totalitarian states. It is these beliefs that we must cherish and strengthen. For it is these beliefs that inspire us—and inform all of us why our nation and our civilization are worth protecting.

These are beliefs that General Eisenhower represented in his life and in his career. But since I have mentioned General Eisenhower, it seems appropriate also to mention his two-time opponent for the Presidency, Adlai Stevenson.

For Stevenson also exemplified these beliefs—and articulated them with great eloquence. Moreover, the association of Dwight Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson tells us something more about the American Republic. They represent the quest for nonpartisanship in our external affairs—our attempt, insofar as possible, to have our politics cease at the water's edge. They represent the search for consensus, which must in a democracy undergird the successful pursuit of foreign policy. We are, of course, most keenly aware of the need for consensus, when, as in recent years, it has partly broken down. And, finally, Eisenhower and his opponent embody to a large degree the successful attainment of national unity and purpose.

In a speech in 1952 to a companion organization, the American Legion, Stevenson identified an additional element of national strength—indispensable, too easily neglected or even mocked, but in this Bicentennial Year becoming better appreciated. It is patriotism—the cohesive force in our society. Stevenson's comments are moving:

"And those voices which we have heard most clearly and which are best remembered in our public life have always had the accent of patriotism.

"It was always accounted a virtue in a man to love his country. With us it now is something more than a virtue. It is a necessity, a condition of survival. When an American says that he loves his country, he means not only that he loves the New England hills, the prairies glistening in the sun, the wide and rising plains, the great mountains, and the sea. He means that he loves an inner air, an inner light in which freedom lives and in which a man can draw the breath of self-respect.

"Men who have offered their lives for their country know that patriotism is not the fear of something; it is the love of something. Patriotism with us is not the hatred of Russia; it is the love of this Republic and of the ideal of liberty of man and mind in which it was born, and to which this Republic is dedicated.

"With this patriotism—patriotism in its large and wholesome meaning—America can master its power and turn it to the noble cause of peace. We can maintain military power without militarism; political power without oppression; and moral power without compulsion or complacency."

In facing the challenge of our Third Century, with all the responsibilities that America must bear, we shall need that cohesive force to sustain American strength. We shall need a restraint on partisanship and a restored consensus. We shall need a full appreciation of those distinctive values that define us as a nation. Through the efforts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the many free associations across this land, I am sure we will achieve these great ends.

Again, thank you for this honor. Good night. God bless you all.

IN SUPPORT FOR A CHANGE IN AFRICA

HON. ANDREW YOUNG

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have often cited in the past few years the desperate need for substantive change in South Africa. I have argued that a nonviolent, peaceful approach would be the best way to hasten such change on the part of the minority white Government of South Africa.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the schoolchildren of Soweto marched peacefully to show their opposition to current educational practices. Their parents petitioned peacefully to support their children. Workers struck peacefully to protest the inequities of the workplace and the Government's oppressive policies.

South Africa's response so far has been a hail of police bullets, indiscriminately killing men, women, and children alike. So far, I, for one, can see no sweeping changes to loosen the bonds which dominate and subjugate the human spirit in South Africa. Whites refuse to give up their privileges which are built upon the backs of cheap black labor. And blacks, especially the young, refuse any longer to live under the same oppression of their parents' generation, and those before them. And they are right to no longer wish to live the broken lives of their parents, to daily experience the crushing weight of technological "apartheid" in an era of history unparalleled in its movement toward social justice and political self-determination.

A country, as great and large and rich as ours, has a special responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to use its good offices to influence the white minority regimes of southern Africa to accept majority rule. South Africa in particular should be made to face the reality that the interests of the United States are not coterminous nor reconcilable with those of the present Vorster government. U.S. industrialists and bank presidents should ask themselves how long they can continue to make viable profits in an in-

creasingly unstable environment or remain productive in the face of their cheap labor's work stoppages. Commonsense should tell U.S. participants in South Africa at all levels, economic, diplomatic, and cultural, that the country is undergoing convulsive change despite the Government's refusal to recognize the obvious. South Africa may become even more repressive toward its majority population, but it will never again maintain the same status quo.

The special contribution of the articles by Anthony Lewis in the New York Times is their comprehension of this essential fact: The South African facade has been exposed for all to see; the myth that blacks in South Africa are content has been exploded to bits. Secretary Kissinger's overtures to Vorster on the Rhodesian and Namibian questions have been seriously hindered by this revealed cancer within South Africa and by his tendency to practice a bankrupt personal diplomacy. If one reads Godwin Matatu's article on Soweto in Africa magazine, one is truly disturbed by the intransigence of South Africa's whites to accede power and by black response to this obstacle. The time for cosmetic changes are over, Mr. Speaker. Racial dignity and social justice, along with political liberty, can no longer be denied.

(From the New York Times,
Aug. 26, 1976)

RECKONING IN AFRICA: I (By Anthony Lewis)

During the last two months, while Americans have been preoccupied with their own politics, events likely to be of much more lasting significance have been taking place half a world away. The disturbances in the black townships of South Africa, and the white reaction to them, have a profound import for world politics—and for one's view of human character.

There have been explosions of black unrest in South Africa before; tension is hardly surprising in a country where more than 80 percent of the people are condemned by their race to be treated forever as serfs. But the events of 1976 are very different. Black protest has gone on much longer; and the white government's response has been uncertain, indeed contradictory.

In the past, the common pattern has been a single incident, met by unyielding repression. But the trouble that began with the riots in Soweto last June 16 has spread, not stopped. More than 250 people have been killed and 1,500 injured.

For protest to continue so long is extraordinary under the conditions of black life in South Africa. Urban blacks must live in satellite townships such as Soweto, outside Johannesburg, where they can easily be confined by the police and the military in case of trouble. Food has to be brought in from outside. Blacks are forbidden to have any weapons. Leading blacks believe, with reason, that the security police have planted agents among them.

On top of these normally restrictive circumstances, the blacks are under particular economic pressure right now. South Africa is suffering from a falling gold price and domestic recession. Unemployment among urban blacks is now 20 percent, and they have no unemployment compensation. Most men with jobs would hesitate to risk them by joining in protest, however aggrieved they felt at earning one-tenth of white wages or suffering other racial indignities.

Yet the protest has gone on. The spark has come from precisely the source that many blacks predicted when I was there a year ago: the young. Children as young as 13 have been willing to face guns—and have been killed by the police. There is a generational change of mood.

The Government gave way quickly to the students' original demand: It dropped the requirement that Afrikaans, language of the ruling whites, be used as a medium of instruction in black schools.

Then the Government took a conciliatory step of even greater significance. It granted blacks the right to buy the little concrete houses in townships such as Soweto instead of living there as tenants. Until now they have been forbidden to own any real property, and the change is philosophically inconsistent with the official view that blacks are mere temporary sojourners in the "white" areas that cover 87 percent of South Africa.

Such concessions to black opinion go against the whole history of South Africa, and they must signify some changes in attitudes.

But along with the concessions have come strong reassertions of the basic Government ideology: that South Africa is a white country in which blacks will never have any political rights. Officials have repeated that blacks are given passes to enter white areas only to sell their labor. Authorities even announced that by 1983 Pretoria, the capital, will be "white by night": The black servants who now have rooms in back yards will have to move to barracks-like hostels outside the city.

For those who hope to see official rigidity ease, the most discouraging aspect of the last two months has been the Government's sweeping use of its power to detain any supposed security risk indefinitely without trial. So far about 170 persons are known to have been arrested, a few of them white journalists and lecturers, most black church and community leaders.

Arrest in South Africa is a more frightening thing than most Americans would readily understand. To take an exceptionally mild example, among the whites picked up last month was an English woman, Mrs. Susan Rabkin, who was six months pregnant. She was held in solitary confinement for two weeks, until finally external pressure—including an appeal by Mrs. James Callaghan, wife of the British Prime Minister—won her release on bail. She has still not been told what charges she faces.

Prisoners who are not foreigners, and especially blacks, are not so lucky as Mrs. Rabkin. In recent years 23 South Africans died while in police custody of mysterious bruising and "suicides." Children as young as five, arrested for stealing, are beaten with canes.

The South African Government has responded in the last two months with contradictory signals. The impression blacks are bound to have is that there is no real change—no recognition of shared humanity—but only grudging concessions to pressure. That is a recipe for continuing confrontation.

(From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1976)

RECKONING IN AFRICA: II (By Anthony Lewis)

The frank language of white supremacy in South Africa has been officially replaced by such terms as "apartheid" (separateness) and more recently the blander "separate development" and "separate freedoms." All are intended to convey the Government's basic political theory: that the black majority will have rights only in small tribal "homelands" while the whites keep total control of 87 percent of South Africa.

The pretensions of that official doctrine have been stripped away by the explosions in the black townships. No rational person can believe, any longer, that apartheid assures peace and contentment—or that the millions of urban Africans want to be citizens of a far-off, backward "homeland" that they may never have seen, while being treated as alien serfs where they live and work.

Some important figures among the dominant white group, the Afrikaners have called for fundamental rethinking of their political theory. Privately, a few will say that the doctrine of separate development is dead. But it is extremely hard for the Government to abandon, and outsiders should understand that.

Prime Minister B. J. Vorster finds much of his basic constituency among deeply conservative Afrikaner farmers and workers. When the blacks make trouble, the talk in a bar is likely to be about "killing Kaffirs," not about political theory. The sheer weight of numbers is bound to make most whites uneasy about concessions: They are less than 18 percent of the population. And so, even when policies have demonstrably failed, compromise is painfully difficult.

Recently, for example, leaders of the African "homelands" issued a statement criticizing restrictions on freedom of movement and calling for free, compulsory education for blacks. The leading white businessmen—who have become wary of relying for labor on a rootless, frustrated, dehumanized mass—issued a statement of their own making the same two points.

The right to work where you can find a job, and to bring your family with you; the right to public education for your children. Americans would regard those as among the most elementary human expectations, but they are beyond the expectation of black South Africans. They cannot enter any city or other white area without a special pass, and they cannot ordinarily bring their families with them until they have kept a job and residence in a white area for many years.

To give way to black yearnings for a decent education in the townships, or freedom of movement, would imply acceptance of blacks as permanent citizens of South Africa. To us that seems the acceptance of reality. But to many white South Africans it would be an alarming abandonment of basic premises.

It is not surprising, therefore, to see the South African Government caught in a kind of immobilism. Fifteen or 20 years ago it would have repressed the black unrest with unconcerned brutality, as it did at the time of the Sharpeville massacre in 1960. Today it worries too much about foreign, especially American, opinion to do that. But it has been too worried about its own constituents' opinion to make any real change in policy.

Mr. Vorster himself has said almost nothing during these turbulent months. His ministers have alternately blamed conspiracies by black power advocates for all the trouble, and hinted at constructive reforms. The most concrete Government action has been to detain hundreds of blacks, without charge on suspicion of political troublemaking.

The situation cries out for talks between black leaders and the Government. Moderate blacks are almost as afraid of chaos or revolutionary change as the whites, and they are eager to talk. The Minister of Justice, James Kruger, has now called a meeting with urban blacks.

But here again there are obstacles that outsiders would not readily understand. Most of the natural African leaders have been jailed or banned by the Government: Nelson Mandela, a prisoner on Robben Island, Robert Sobukwe confined to the small town of Kimberley. And whenever new leaders arise, as

in the recent protests, they are immediately lopped off. The Government instinctively imprisons those with whom it should be talking.

In short, the South African situation is complicated, and the outlook is gloomy. Moreover, the time is out of joint. Years ago, people used to talk about revolution coming soon in South Africa. That proved quite wrong, and nothing significant would change for a very long time. That was wrong, too.

All this has important consequences for the United States. Secretary of State Kissinger discovered southern Africa this year and made a policy. It was to get Mr. Vorster's support for change on the fringe of his country, in Rhodesia and Namibia, while postponing until later any consideration of the larger issues in South Africa itself. But the assumptions underlying that policy have been shaken.

The turmoil at home limits Mr. Vorster's ability to supply leverage against the Rhodesian white minority. And the central issues of racial peace and justice in South Africa can no longer be avoided—by its government.

[From Africa (magazine), August 1976]

SOUTH AFRICA AFTER SOWETO

(By Godwin Matatu)

In the immediate aftermath of last month's rebellion in Soweto and other Black suburbs in the Transvaal in which, according to official figures, 176 people died, South Africa's Department of Bantu Education reversed the ruling that made it compulsory for Black schoolchildren to be taught certain subjects in the medium of Afrikaans. It was this language issue that set aflame the deep-seated bitterness of Black South African society and pierced through the deceptive calm that prevailed in the country since the Sharpeville Massacre 16 years ago.

The government's *volte face*, no doubt, represents a victory for the children of Soweto. However, if it was intended to spirit away the inherent problems that characterize South Africa today, it manifestly failed; Soweto represented much more than can be disposed of by statutory abolition. It symbolized all the facets of South African society: Black resistance, White repression, White misperceptions of Black South Africa, the absurdity of the policy of Bantustans and South Africa's pariah status in the international community.

The resistance that Soweto sparked off has not subsided and there are indications that the entire country may soon be engulfed in a wave of violence. Throughout last month there were reports of clashes between the police and the Black community in various parts of South Africa. The largest and most serious to date was in Mitbank, 75 miles east of Johannesburg, where about 4,000 people marched on the offices of the local administration. In the ensuing disturbances, police opened fire and killed four people, wounding many others; government buildings, shops, cars and schools were burned down. There were also other disturbances in Randfontein, Hartbeesfontein and Fort Hare University in the Eastern Cape Province in which buildings were set ablaze.

The situation in Soweto itself is potentially explosive and heavily armed police and army units maintain a 24-hour patrol in the city. Black schools have been closed indefinitely; they were scheduled to have been opened on July 20. The Minister of Justice, Police and Prisons, Jimmy Kruger stated that the schools would remain closed because of "continued agitation and intimidation in Soweto and other areas aimed at renewed rioting when schools re-open in spite of the fact that the language issue had been resolved". He believed that the detention of more than 30 schoolchildren in John Vorster

Square Police headquarters would be "used as an issue by agitators".

It is also understood that Black organizations in Soweto are organizing a general strike; should this occur, there is a strong possibility that, like last month's disturbances, it will spread to other parts of Witwatersrand, if not the entire country. Equally, a general strike is likely to be met with repression. By all accounts the situation is tense. As one Soweto resident put it: "Our anger has not subsided; we smell blood in the air, not just smoke anymore."

Just as draconian legislation followed Sharpeville, escalated repression has followed Soweto. The era of widespread internment has arrived in South Africa with the announcement by the Minister of Justice on July 15 that the preventive detention sections of the Internal Security Act, poignantly known as the "SS" Act, would become immediately operative to counter what he termed "agitation in the Black areas". The preventive clause in the Act provides the Justice Minister with powers to detain a person for one year without trial or charge, this period is renewable on expiry. There are fears in the Black community that the Act will be used against a substantial majority of the 3,000 people detained after Soweto against whom no specific charges have so far been made.

In addition, a nationwide ban on gatherings and public meetings has been imposed. Jimmy Kruger promised that "law and order will be maintained at all costs" and that strong police units would be on hand to deal with any trouble. "These units," he said, "will have instructions to protect law-abiding citizens at all cost and to do so with all the means at their disposal."

The autopsy on Soweto by White South Africans revealed the extent to which they misperceive the predicament that faces the country. The government and the ruling National Party establishment appear not to have learnt anything from Soweto, and they have turned a blind eye to the fundamental cases of the disturbances. They have ignored and underplayed the seriousness of the situation and the underlying bitterness and frustration of the Black community. Their response to the situation in the midst of calls for reforms, however cosmetic, has been to re-affirm apartheid and introduce tightened security. In the South African Parliament, for example, bitter attacks were launched on the Progressive Reform Party (PRP)—South Africa's fast growing liberal party, which might replace the United Party as the Opposition at the next elections. The Party was accused of instigating the disturbances, of being a "fifth column" and working for a "Black socialist alliance". The PRP had done no more than call for a broader inquiry into the underlying causes of Soweto.

The Party establishment also made it clear that it was not going to deviate one iota from the basic principles of apartheid. In fact, the rank and file of the National Party are calling for "stricter control" of Black people. It is confidently predicted that the removal of petty apartheid, which the South Africa government has been selling to the world as an earnest of the move toward change will be reversed. It is expected that when the Transvaal Congress of the National Party—representing half of the National Party Caucus—is convened in September, the rank and file will censure the government for being "too soft" with the Black community. Thus, if anything, South Africa is moving further to the right.

It is true that the enlightened or liberal elements of White South African society, have drawn some lessons from Soweto and called for change. However, their perception of the problem is limited. For them, the problems confronting South Africa are those

of the "urban Blacks" and the absence of any channels of communications between Blacks and Whites. Hence they have been calling for political rights to be extended to urban Blacks and a greater say in the administration of the townships. Specifically, they suggest security of tenure for urban Blacks, increased power for the Urban Bantu Councils and Black control of the Bantu Administration Boards. While such suggestion would undermine the tenet of apartheid that designates Blacks in "White areas" as migrants or temporary sojourners, in essence it implies no more than the bantustanization of Black suburbs. At any rate, the liberal answer is only peripheral to the central issue in South Africa—Black control of political power at a national level.

Soweto, itself a monument to the absurdity of apartheid because of its ethnically heterogeneous population, also exposed the myth that the true spokesmen of the Black masses are the homeland leaders. The Bantustan leaders manifestly had very little power to influence events during the rebellion, and their pleas for calm were ignored. Further, the fact that the rebellion spread to some homelands also exposed the fiction that Blacks in the homelands are content with their leaders. In many respects, the rebellion was as much against the homelands as it was against the entire system.

The apartheid regime has been at pains to project Soweto as no more than a ripple in a calm lake. The government is still assuring its allies that a new dawn is breaking in South Africa; that it is introducing changes that, coupled with the "independence" of the homelands, will take care of the "Black problem" for all time. However, the reality is different; and Soweto was only part of it. Perhaps the beginning of the end is being enacted in a courtroom in Plerermaritzburg where ten members of the African National Congress (ANC) are on trial on charges of recruiting young men for training in guerrilla warfare. As ANC Acting President Oliver Tambo intimated at the OAU Summit in Mauritius, now there will no longer be the need for recruiting; the children of Soweto will just come and swell the ranks of the guerrilla army. South Africa after Soweto will never be the same.

PROPOSES NATIONAL GEM TO BE TURQUOISE

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of House Joint Resolution 274, the bill to name turquoise as the National Gemstone, I would like to include in the RECORD the resolution passed by the board of directors of the International Turquoise Association in support of my resolution. It is as follows:

Be it therefore resolved that the Board of Directors of the International Turquoise Association, a non-profit corporation, do hereby by unanimous vote urge Congress to approve and pass the Honorable Manuel Lujan, Jr. bill naming turquoise as our National Gemstone, particularly to coincide with our current Bicentennial Year.

Our country has no national stone. We believe that when Americans think of turquoise, they think of it as not only American, but of its relationship with the jewelry made by our native American Indians.

Turquoise truly reflects our traditional, historical and esthetic values. No other stone

in America meets the qualifications in beauty, desirability, rich history and culture so inter-woven with this beautiful natural heritage. It is truly a gemstone we can be proud to call, "Our National Gemstone".

STIFF PRISON SENTENCES A BLOW TO SOUTH KOREAN OPPOSITION

HON. CARDESS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend of August 28, 1976 the South Korean Government handed down verdicts in the controversial civil liberties case involving former Presidential candidate Kim Dae Jong and other prominent civilians in the country.

Those of us who have been interested in the trial and the question of the treatment of nonviolent political dissenters in South Korea are discouraged by this verdict. The men and women sentenced in this case are elder statesmen and stateswomen of South Korea who have been committed for years to the maintenance of democratic principles in their land. The prison sentences in this case will, I fear, go a long way toward discouraging peaceful dissent in South Korea. As my colleagues know, the act for which these men and women were tried was the simple act of publishing a document calling for the restoration of democratic freedoms in their country.

While none of us in this Chamber can dispute the importance of South Korea as a frontier of American interests in Asia, we cannot condone assaults on human rights in any society however important the region may be to American interests.

Because this trial is an important indicator of the level and standard of human rights activity in South Korea, I wish to include a report of the sentencing for my colleagues' use:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 29, 1976]

STIFF PRISON SENTENCES A BLOW TO SOUTH KOREAN OPPOSITION

(By John Saar)

SEOUL.—The nonviolent opposition to the government of South Korea suffered a severe blow today when a Seoul judge handed down stiff prison sentences for 18 Christian leaders.

One by one, priest, ministers, professors, theologians and political figures rose in a packed and hushed courtroom to receive sentences ranging from two to eight years for their roles in writing and disseminating a manifesto demanding the full restoration of democracy. They had been charged with agitating for the overthrow of South Korean dictator Park Chung Hee after the document was read at an ecumenical service in Seoul's Roman Catholic Myongdong Cathedral March 1.

The central figure in the case, Kim Dae Jong, a charismatic political leader, hobbled from the courtroom on scatica-crippled legs with a defiant smile and an eight-year sentence. He acknowledged shouts of "carry on your fight" with a victory sign and a wave.

A photograph in his home shows him in the same pose waving to a huge crowd during

the 1971 election when he almost defeated President Park.

"It is a sad day for Korea. The law has perished," one of the seven defendants who was freed pending appeal told reporters.

Gloom and shock over the sentences more severe than expected—was apparent in the courthouse grounds after the remaining defendants were driven away in two curtained buses.

Steven Cardinal Kim called the verdict "a tragedy for the country."

"It's a real setback for the opposition," observed a foreign missionary, "because it lowers the level of courage. People will be much more afraid to speak out."

Also among the 18 defendants were:

Former president Yun Po Sun, a frail man of 79 who stood erect clutching a panama hat by the brim: eight years.

American-educated theology professor Mun Ik What, eight years, and his brother, the Rev. Steven Moon, five years.

Hahn Suk Hon, 75, a legendary leader of nonviolent resistance with flowing white hair and beard. A veteran of detentions under Japanese and Russian occupiers and the government of Syngman Rhee, Hon wore a beige funeral robe to court: eight years.

National Assemblyman Chung Yil Hyung, 72, by reputation a gentle and courageous man: five years.

Chung's wife, Yi Tae Young, South Korea's first woman lawyer and winner of a Magsaysay Award for her legal work among the urban poor: five years.

Behind the trial is a clash of wills between a Western-influenced elite who continue to seek democracy though their numbers are low and organization poor, and a powerful ruler cut from the Confucian mold.

While guiding the country through 15 years of staggering economic growth, President Park has steadily eliminated political freedoms in the name of unity against North Korea.

Observers believe that Seoul government officials carefully calculated the risks of arousing American public opinion over the Myongdong trial and decided they were acceptable. The recent killings of two American officers at Panmunjom and the usual domestic preoccupations of a U.S. presidential campaign can be expected to soften the American reaction.

[News agencies reported from Panmunjom that North Korea and the U.S.-led United Nations command agreed to hold lower-level staff meetings to discuss new security arrangements in the truce village.]

American embassy officials say they lobby unofficially but effectively to moderate the South Korean government's treatment of political offenders.

An expanding sense of military and economic self-confidence, however seems to have bred a willingness to disregard American public opinion if necessary. Some officials here privately hold that the relationship between the two countries is slowly crumbling.

In a clear public relations effort, Information Ministry officials threw a buffet lunch for visiting foreign correspondents today immediately after the Myongdong verdicts were announced. Immaculate in a dark suit and popping black grapes into his mouth as he spoke, Vice Minister Kim Dong Hwi said: "We are acting with prudence and restraint . . . This is only a small tiny thing."

The vice minister denied that Kim Dae Jong and the other defendants constituted a loyal opposition.

"They are breaking the law and the law is made by ourselves . . . The people on this land are Koreans, not foreigners," he said.

The very fact that he was able to speak freely with foreign correspondents proved that freedom exists here, the vice minister said.

117TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WORLD'S FIRST OIL WELL

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, an important historical event occurred Friday, August 27, in this Bicentennial Year. It was the 117th anniversary of the drilling of the world's first oil well, which took place August 27, 1859, and ultimately changed the destiny of man.

The well was drilled by the fabled Col. Edwin L. Drake along Oil Creek near Titusville, Pa. It took some time for the outside world to learn about Colonel Drake's success. Seventeen days after his successful effort, a correspondent for the New York Daily Tribune on September 13, 1859, reported:

The excitement attendant on the discovery of this vast source of oil was fully equal to what I saw in California when a large lump of gold was accidentally turned out.

To commemorate the 1859 drilling, the Department of the Interior has published an attractive, interesting historical vignette describing the events and persons that played a part in Colonel Drake's successful quest.

The vignette is titled "Success at Oil Creek" and was written by Charles E. Wallace of the Department of the Interior's public affairs staff and is for sale by the Government Printing Office. I am including herewith the Interior Department news release describing the publication. I am confident that historians, journalists, and others will find this vignette extremely readable and informative.

DRAMA LEADING TO DRILLING OF WORLD'S FIRST OIL WELL DESCRIBED IN VIGNETTE

The Department of the Interior has published its second Bicentennial historical vignette—Success at Oil Creek—which describes the drama and events that led to the drilling of the world's first oil well in 1859 by Colonel Edwin L. Drake near Titusville, Pennsylvania.

The recognized birth of the petroleum industry in the United States occurred August 27, 1859, along Oil Creek in western Pennsylvania. There, the famed Colonel Drake, a former railroad conductor and jack-of-all-trades, proved that oil could be found in quantity by drilling into the earth.

At 69½ feet, the hole he bored filled with oil to signal monumental changes in the development of the world and the history of man.

"Few," the vignette states, "could visualize the magnitude of Drake's accomplishment. The first newspaper mention of the event came 17 days later. Drake's well and subsequent oil drilling apparently were not reported on by Secretaries of the Interior until many years afterward."

"But, along Oil Creek, interest soared in Drake's achievement. As news of his success spread, western Pennsylvania became the scene of the biggest land rush since the scramble for gold in California in 1849."

The groundwork for Drake's success began in 1853, when Dr. Francis B. Brewer arrived at Hanover, New Hampshire, carrying a tiny vial of petroleum taken from the old oil spring two miles south of Titusville.

A Dartmouth chemistry professor found

the oil very valuable but doubted enough could be produced for commercial purposes. Later, a Yale professor analyzed quantities brought from the oil spring and declared Dr. Brewer's supporters had in their possession a raw material from which could be manufactured "very valuable products."

An oil company was formed and Colonel Drake was named General Agent to go to Oil Creek and drill for oil. Following numerous disappointments, Drake finally attained his objective Saturday afternoon, August 27, 1859.

The 24-page illustrated Bicentennial Vignette, Success At Oil Creek, is for sale for 65 cents by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. The stock number is 024-000-00823-1.

HOWARD C. VAN ARSDALE

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on a recent visit to Williamsburg, Va., I was fortunate to hear an address given by Mr. Howard C. Van Arsdale of Alexandria, Va., regarding the role of the Dutch during the American Revolution. Mr. Van Arsdale is councilor general of the Virginia society and an ardent historian.

I would like to take this opportunity to share with my distinguished colleagues Mr. Van Arsdale's enlightening remarks:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH ON HOWARD C. VAN ARSDALE

Howard Van Arsdale of Alexandria, Va., is Councilor General for the newly-formed Virginia Society and also a life member of the Maine Society. He is 10th in line from Simon Janson van Aertsdaalen, one of the original founders of New Amsterdam. He is a former vice-president of the Holland Society of New York and founded its Potomac Branch in Washington. He is also a member of the Huguenot Society and many other genealogical groups. He headed the Nationalities Division of the Republican National Committee and has been twice presented to the Royal Family of the Netherlands for his outstanding contributions to the Dutch. His business career has been exciting and varied and includes early promotion of Miami Beach with Steve Hanagan, and Asheville, N.C., with Luke Lee, and development of AAA clubs in New England. With his wife, the former Ruth Torr, he is now involved with real estate investments.

ADDRESS BY MR. HOWARD VAN ARSDALE

The discovery of America by Columbus in 1492, the settlement at Jamestown by the English in 1607, the founding of Quebec by the French in 1608, and the discovery of New Netherlands by Henry Hudson in 1609, are among the most important events and fraught with the most wonderful results in all history.

The people of the Netherlands had thrown off a dominion they opposed. Then they gave harbor and home to the Pilgrims from England. At least three men in the company—Bradford, Allerton, and Priest—had, by payment of extra taxes, become citizens of Leyden, thereby enjoying certain municipal privileges, while three or four of the educated men—Robinson, Brewster, Brewer, and Bastwick—were already members of the university, and several more were property owners. Among them were several printers,

of whom Brewer and Brewster were busily engaged in publishing not only works acceptable to all lovers of learning and literature, but in issuing controversial pamphlets in the interest of soul-freedom, as they saw it. The publications of this Pilgrim Press in Choir Alley, Leyden, between October, 1616, and June, 1619, were as red-pepper in the eyes of King James, whose wrath was so roused by two anonymous pamphlets that he would have had the whole nest of Separatists exterminated had it been possible. King James was not happy over Holland and these Dutchmen, who had made him ridiculous in the eyes of the world.

The Speedwell and the Mayflower both sailed from Plymouth in mid-August. The Mayflower came into port. The Speedwell anchored outside. Aboard the Speedwell were the ringleaders King James was looking for, especially Brewster. He had been trying to get his hands on him for some time and would no doubt have hanged him. The signing of the Mayflower Pact was a part of the price agreed on when Brewster hired the Mayflower for the voyage.

They did not come to America until Hudson had shown to Holland the way to a continent large enough and remote enough for the safety of all who regarded themselves as the victims of persecution for opinion's sake.

I am puzzled to know why there has been so long unsounded this lost chord in American history. I suppose several things contributed to this neglect. One reason may lie in that quiet modesty of the Dutch, in which the Yankee does not share at all. A larger reason doubtless lies in the fact that politically New Amsterdam early ceased to be a Dutch colony, and became officially English. The English have written the books. The English have told the story. If John Bull ever suffered his light to be hidden under a bushel, I cannot recall the occasion.

There was a tablet in the court of the recently demolished Produce Exchange near the Customs House in downtown New York that marked the location of the first school in New Amsterdam, taught by Adam Roelandsen. It was also the first school of which there is any record in America.

Another first: In 1648, when the northernmost limits of the town extended no further than Wall Street, Governor Pieter Stuyvesant laid the basic foundations of New York's and the nation's volunteer fire-fighting system when he appointed four fire wardens.

A Medical first in America: When the 17th century began, doctors cured much more by personality than by their remedies and practices. As a consequence, this era witnessed the discoveries of Anthony van Leeuwenhoek, who built the microscope and was the first to describe the corpuscular formation of the blood, and those arising from Christian Huyghens' epochal studies in the field of optics. Dutch colonial America was the scene of several probable "firsts", notably the first coroner's inquest (1658), and establishment of the first hospital (1659).

First Naval Engagement in American Waters was between the English and the Dutch: It will be recalled that the Seventeenth Century saw England at war with the Netherlands. And in this contest, "New England" did not come out unscathed. On June 4, 1667, Newport News witnessed a one-sided naval engagement when five Dutch warships under one Abraham Crimmon sailed into Hampton Roads, passed some twenty small vessels of England's tobacco fleet at the mouth of the James, and continued up the river. Several miles upstream the Netherlands encountered the British frigate Elizabeth, mounting forty-six guns, which was the sole defender of Chesapeake waters.

The Dutchmen were flying the English colors and, as they passed the tobacco ships, they even sang out the soundings in English. But as they approached the Elizabeth they opened fire. Taken completely by surprise,

the frigate could offer no resistance. Her captain was ashore attending a wedding, and the remainder of her crew was forced to surrender after firing only one volley. Having disposed of the Elizabeth, the Netherlands retraced their course to overtake the tobacco fleet. Some of its vessels were burned and the other made prizes.

The first American book was written by a Virginian, John Smith, one year after its settlement. The next one, maybe, was written by a New England Governor; it was not very long after this time that books were written about New York, but as they were published in Dutch, the world has forgotten they belonged to American literature. But if we pass over the journals and sermons and come to the real beginning of American literature, we find that its father was born in New York in 1783, lived his life in New York and died in his beautiful home on the Hudson in 1859, where his grave is a shrine to this day in Sleepy Hollow Cemetery. He was the creator of Rip Van Winkle and Diedrich Knickerbocker.

Since our school days we have heard the story of the Boston massacre, March 5, 1770, when Crispus Attucks, who was a gentleman of color, fell, and we have read the story of the Boston Tea Party. But the world has never known the fact that in the same quarrel, that a whole year earlier, the people of New York, in resisting the landing of the tea, organized their Indians, which they called "Mohawks" and thus set Boston the example, and that in July, 1773, when the 10 year quarrel came to a head, some of the people of Boston used this same idea. The story is that the East India Company was commissioned to deliver tea to Charleston, Philadelphia, New York and Boston, but were turned away at all ports except Boston, the first of the ships arriving there on November 28, 1773, the other two shortly afterward.

Once again the English wrote the story—this time of the Boston Tea Party—but omitted giving credit to the Dutch and other citizens of New York who originally mobilized their "Mohawks". In Boston on the 16th of December in the Old South Meeting House, Samuel Adams uttered the immortal words "Let there be freedom": and, thus the signal was given for the Boston Tea Party. From the doors of the meeting house emerged men disguised as Mohawk Indians, among them Paul Revere and John Hancock, and from under his Indian blanket, Hancock's lace cuffs protruded making him easily identifiable. He was a "dandy" in those days.

And now let us note that the first blood that was shed in the war was not shed in the Boston Massacre or at Lexington, but in the battle of Golden Hill near the corner of John and Williams streets in New York when the British soldiers were put to flight by the New York citizens, mostly Dutch. Let us give honor to Lexington and Concord and Bunker Hill, but let us not forget what lay between Lexington and Bunker Hill. In the month of May the Americans captured Fort Ticonderoga, which was the first successful battle of the Revolution. Remember that Boston was freed of the British by the army of Washington, in the first year of the war, and from that time throughout the Charles River flowed unchecked to the sea. But remember that after the battle of Long Island, which occurred in the same year, the British took possession of New York City and the lower valley of the Hudson and New Jersey, which they made the base of all their operations, and which was a captive community for eight long years. No other community ever suffered one-half so much as New York, and although we do not know it there is no other place on the continent, Boston not excepted, where there are so many historic revolutionary shrines as in and about

New York. It was here that Washington fought his first battle. It was here that the Declaration of Independence was first read to the army. On the 9th of July, 1776, New York received news that Congress had adopted the Declaration of Independence by the vote of twelve of the Colonies. New York not voting as her delegates had not received instructions. On the evening of the same day by order of Washington, it was read before every brigade of his army then stationed in New York.

On July 26, 1581 a step was taken which could never be retraced. It was after long hesitation and deliberation that the Act of Abjuration was signed at the Hague, which solemnly declared their independence of Phillip and renounced their allegiance forever. Patrick Henry was given credit in our history, with the help of a few others, of writing our Declaration of Independence. I wonder just how much of our Declaration of Independence was original. If you will get and read the English translation of the Act of Abjuration which is found in Lord Somers' Tracts and reprinted in full in the Old South Historical Leaflet #72, Boston, 1896, it is very interesting to compare the text of this Dutch document with our Declaration of Rights and the Act of Abjuration from Phillip the Second and with the American Declaration of Independence signed on July 4, 1776.

Fort Amsterdam was erected in 1626 and its successor, Fort George was demolished in 1790. To commemorate the exploration of the Hudson River by Henry Hudson in September 1609, the founding of New Amsterdam May 4, 1626, and the establishment of American Independence 1775-1783.

When the British left New York on the morning of November 25, 1783, they were supposed to haul down the flag they had flying over Fort George at the Battery. Instead they unreefed the halyards, knocked all climbing cleats off the pole and then greased the pole, top to bottom. When General Washington got to the Battery, John van Arsdale, a young sailor, tried in vain to get the British banner down. Finally he ran to Goelst's hardware shop in Pearl Street, got a fistful of large hand-made nails and used them for foot-holds.

He carried a thirteen-starred American flag with him. He put this in place after he got the British flag down.

Let's not forget the heroic women who also took part in our struggle for freedom. The gallant defense against the Hessian Troops by the Maryland and Virginia Regiment 16 November 1776 was shared by Margaret Corbin the first American woman to take a soldier's part in the War for Liberty.

About 1772, Margaret married John Corbin, a Virginian by birth, and when, at the beginning of the Revolution, he enlisted in Capt. Proctor's First Company, Pennsylvania Artillery, she, having no children to demand her care at home, accompanied her husband, giving woman's care to him and his comrades in the army.

She resided in Westmoreland County, beloved, honored, and respected by every one. She died about 1800, DeLancey writing of the capitulation of Fort Washington, he wrote: The deed of the Maid of Zargoza was not nobler, truer, braver, than that of Margaret Corbin, of Pennsylvania.

From the battle of Lexington, on the 19th of April, 1775, when untrained Minute Men defeated British veterans and drove them in panic to the shelter of their entrenchments, to the surrender of Cornwallis at Yorktown, on the 19th of October, 1781, the story of American valor is written in living letters. What memories of heroic conflict are associated with the names Bunker Hill, Fort Washington, Trenton, Princeton, Ticonderoga, Bennington, Brandywine, Bemis Heights, Monmouth, Stony Point, King's Mountain, Cowpens, Guilford, Eutaw Springs!

I believe first and foremost in the God given freedom of the individual. I believe the Constitution of the United States was the greatest instrument ever devised by man for the protection and preservation of that freedom, that is the Constitution as written by the founders of the American Republic and as taken from the Dutch Constitution of 1529, but not as rewritten in the past 23 or 24 years by the Supreme Court.

For my own part I have faith and no fear. Our State and nation will preserve the form the founders impressed and broaden the faith the fathers felt. Freedom and Union will safeguard us from the tyranny of power and from the stagnation of anarchy. Liberty will shield us from license. Equal to our day our strength will be, and equal to that our duty. Liberty sometimes is spoken of as though it were a catch word for the populace, but liberty is the simplest thing in the world if we interpret it rightly. What is meant by individual liberty is not license, but liberty under law. Any man is a good patriot who stands firmly for personal, individual rights and fights for them, if necessary; but he is only half a patriot if he does not go the other step and do the same thing for his neighbor's rights. That is all there is in the question of individual liberty.

A belief in a thing is frequently a start toward its attainment, and it only becomes possible of attainment when men live it and exemplify it in their lives. Platforms, beliefs, convictions, pronouncements and declarations never become tangibles in the social order until men insist upon them and set out determined to carry them forward. It is more satisfying to the mind and conscience to look forward and upward, for it is only the man who looks forward and upward who passes out of the shadow and into the light.

We are only the trustees of our American heritage—the freedom heritage. We do not own it. We have no right to dissipate it. Our obligation, our responsibility, is to pass it on to our children better and greater even than when we received it in trust.

With the heritage that our heirs assume, the obligation and thus this wealth of ineffable beauty and value is kept by them for a little while to be passed on eventually to their children's children—to generations unborn.

The colors of United Netherlands, the colors which we have kept ever since in our flag; the colors that we were the first to salute on November 19th, 1776, on the Island of St. Eustatius, the colors of the Star Spangled Banner:

"God built this Empire, for the last great act,
One splendid Empire, one plastic fact;
Its mountain ranges answer back the truth,
Its rivers see it in eternal youth,
Its plains unfolded to the setting sun—
One land, one tongue, one destiny and God."

KEEPING ABREAST OF THE HAZARDS OF SILICONE INJECTIONS

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, with Congress becoming ever more conscious of the tremendous technological advancements being made daily in the field of medicine, I feel it is important that my colleagues have the true facts regarding a most controversial and hazardous medical treatment. I am speaking, of course, about

the ill-conceived practice of injecting liquid silicone into the body for cosmetic purposes.

A good friend of mine, Dr. Chuck Vinnik of Las Vegas, has championed the fight in Nevada against this dangerous practice and was instrumental in the final passage of a State law making it a felony to inject liquid silicone into the body.

Below is an editorial, authorized by Dr. Vinnik, which appeared in the August 23 edition of the Journal of the American Medical Association. I think you will find his comments most enlightening:

THE HAZARDS OF SILICONE INJECTIONS

The problems that have followed liquid silicone injections to the breast raise concern about and have implications for use of silicone injections in other sites.

Similar clinical problems and histologic skin changes have been reported after silicone injections to the face, extremities, abdomen, and penis, as well as breasts.

Facial skin discoloration, induration, and subcutaneous nodule formation may follow silicone injection, but these are relatively minor complications compared with the aesthetic problems that patients with hemifacial atrophy and lipodystrophy may have to endure without treatment by the silicone procedure. There is no argument that the benefits for these patients outweigh potential local risks.

Quite the opposite may be true for patients seeking injections merely for cosmetic purposes. Here, the risks may far outweigh any possible benefit.

Physicians have assumed that problems associated with silicone injections were caused by adulterated liquid silicone. This is not the case. In Las Vegas and elsewhere, the injections of sterilized, unadulterated medical-grade fluid has also been implicated in adverse reactions.

It has been argued that the complications reported have resulted from use of contaminated silicone. Exposure of large aliquots of the fluid to air has been suggested as the source of physical contamination, and packaging in small glass ampules sealed from air is advanced as the solution. This hypothesis has not been confirmed by either animal or clinical research. Fluid is aspirated from the depths, not the surface of aliquots of liquid silicone, and, therefore, contamination is unlikely.

Liquid silicone is reported to cause histologic responses in animals identical to those reported in humans. Severe clinical problems often develop in humans even though the histologic appearance is remarkably bland. In our experience, breast complications occurred in humans in an average of five years after injection. In a number of patients, facial problems seem to occur 8 to 15 years after silicone injection. Animal studies have not been conducted for any period approaching this length of observation because cost factors of maintaining an animal colony for such periods were believed to preclude long-term animal studies. However, one large primate, killed eight years following injection of silicone, was reported to have "fat necrosis" in the breast. This may be comparable to what occurred in some humans with florid histologic responses.

At least half the patients that I have seen who have had silicone injection into the breasts are having clinical problems. Optimism with respect to the incidence of facial complications may well be premature, when one considers the longer subclinical latent period before such complications occur.

Conflicting viewpoints regarding long-term safety and efficacy of silicone injections in areas other than the breast may be legiti-

mately based on differences in technique and motivation. The individual plastic surgeons authorized by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for silicone injection investigation have been scrupulous in terms of patient selection and technique of injection, and they have been extremely conservative in their injection volume. There are all important factors, and the number of problems reported thus far in their patients has not been numerous. In contrast, thousands of complications have been reported as a result of liquid silicone injections by operators who may have had liquid silicone as their only tool.

Investigators treating cosmetic lesions have used very small volumes as an adjunct to plastic surgical techniques, thus limiting any potential problems to minute areas.

Let us assume that future use of liquid silicone is limited by the FDA to facial injections. Except in Nevada, where the administration of silicone by injection is a felony, FDA regulations will be merely advisory, and professional liability may be a stronger deterrent to unlabeled uses of silicone. Mandatory training in proper techniques has been suggested but would be impractical without statutory restrictions on the medical use of silicone. Approval by the FDA will make the material available to all medical and osteopathic physicians, dentists, podiatrists, and, in at least one State, chiropractors for use by them or their designated aides. The availability of liquid silicone to large numbers of untrained operators will predictably create an incidence of complications dwarfing that now being seen. For these complications, there is no known satisfactory remedy.

Silicone for injection offers benefits for certain rare and bizarre disfigurements and some benefit for cosmetic panacea by an American public searching for a "fountain of youth." Until this careful appraisal can be made, glowing reports of this "miracle" substance in the medical and lay press are premature.

THE CARTER POSTURE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the air is beginning to go out of the balloon. The computerized candidate, Mr. Carter, was programed to say what he thought people wanted to hear, smile at the right moment, and avoid issues or take both sides when in his interest. That carried him a long way but all of a sudden veterans are starting to look at his amnesty bit, small businessmen look at his big spending proposals, and more Government regulation envisioned in the Consumer Protection Agency, the farmer wants none of his controlled economics and the sieve begins to leak.

Bill Buckley has hit the nail on the head with his recent column on the Carter posture. It is accurate, informative, and deserving of your close study.

The article follows:

THE CARTER POSTURE

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

New York.—When a typical Democrat promises full employment without inflation, or full and "free" medical care, the public begins, finally, to sense that it is being trafficked with. Jimmy Carter is not only less than concrete, he seems to take the position that it is somehow vulgar to be concrete.

When he is forced to take a direct stand on an issue—forced, for instance, in front of labor union tribunals to drink to the repeal of 14B—then he appears to be doing so less out of conviction than out of good nature. A matter of indulgence. "If you want to go to the World Series that bad, sonny, why I'll just dig into mah savings and get you a ticket."

Thus, to a black audience Jimmy Carter announces that he is for school integration. And to a white audience he says he is against forced busing. In fact the two positions are not always incompatible. In fact, Jimmy Carter hasn't said what is his position in such parts of the United States where the two positions are indeed incompatible. South Boston, for instance. He would prefer to urge his listeners to believe that under his leadership tensions would dissolve: Why should anybody be mad at anybody else, when Jimmy Carter isn't mad at anybody and loves us all equally?

I tell you, brothers and sisters, it is a formidable posture. And it is in my judgment, and in the judgment of men more practiced in cynicism (the sharp-eyed, sharp-tongued Richard Reeves, for just one example) entirely sincere, even if it is amorphous. I happen myself to believe in the coming of the Lord, but I do not believe that the Lord takes an emphatic moral position on 14B, even if I believe that if Jimmy Carter wanted to exclude all but theological arguments, I could make a monkey out of him in a debate on 14B.

It is most commonly assumed that religion is mere incantation. A nice ritual, suitable for baptisms, weddings and funerals and best delivered by Hallmark. Carter says it in an entirely different context. "In 1967, I had a profound religious experience that changed my life. I accepted Christ into my life."

That, really, is a terrifying statement. And I do not doubt that it is the source of the awe and horror some people are experiencing as Carter heads for the nomination, all but secured by his victory in Pennsylvania. The prospect of a president who would attempt to rule according to the Word is not only anticosmopolitan, it is in the nature of heresy against the commandments of the secular state. Could it be that a President Carter would come out against a particular measure on the grounds that he thought it wrong?

That is the nature of the Carter problem. It is likelier that the system will break him, rather than that he will break the system. It is also quite possible that the general temper of his indulgence would bring him to stress good nature to the breaking-point of discipline. It has been calculated that, while governor, the whole of his administrative indulgences was equal to more than the sum of its parsimonious parts. Promise them simplicity and a decent austerity and give them Macy's window. He will be pressed to the wall in the coming months but my own guess is that he's going to make it.

FRIENDS OF THE EARTH, A NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL GROUP, ENDORSES THE WAXMAN-MAGUIRE AMENDMENT TO THE CLEAN AIR ACT

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will be interested in the following excellent article from the Boston Globe of August 31, 1976.

The article is written by Ann Roose-

velt, the New England representative of the Friends of the Earth. Ms. Roosevelt argues against the Dingell amendment to the 1970 Clean Air Act and argues persuasively that without the enactment of the Waxman-Maguire amendment to the Clean Air Act "millions of people would be unnecessarily exposed to higher levels of dangerous air pollutants."

The article follows:

WAXMAN-MAGUIRE AMENDMENT TO THE CLEAN AIR ACT

(By Ann Roosevelt, representative, Friends of the Earth)

The American public is being told that a nation which put a man on the moon cannot build a relatively pollution-free automobile. But the Swedes already have done it with a Volvo that will be sold in California in 1977. If the Swedes can do it, why can't the US companies?

The Detroit automakers are putting on a blitz of lobbying pressure to get Congress to accept a weakening of automobile emissions requirements. If they are successful, the toll in human misery will be great. The National Academy of Sciences has estimated that pollution caused by automobile emissions is responsible for 4000 deaths and 4 million days of illness a year. The economic cost is "conservatively" estimated at up to \$10 billion a year.

The controversy centers around control of the three most dangerous auto pollutants: hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide and nitrogen oxides. These pollutants are responsible for the smog which affects most major cities. In the Clean Air Act of 1970, Congress established statutory standards expressed in terms of grams per mile for these three pollutants and gave Detroit until the 1975 model year to meet the standards. The automakers' answer was carried in a letter to US Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, written shortly before the Clean Air Act vote in 1970. E. M. Cole, then president of General Motors, wrote: "Accomplishment of these goals . . . is not technologically possible within the time frame required."

The statutory standards still have not been met. They have been postponed by administrative and legislative action three times. The last delay required compliance by 1978, but a further postponement is under way. None of the proposals now under consideration by Congress requires full compliance until 1980, at the earliest. Detroit wants to delay final compliance until well into the 1980s. Once again the auto-makers echo their 1970 statement that compliance before then is technologically impossible.

The facts contradict that statement. Volvo has developed a 1977 car for California which holds emissions below the statutory standards and gets 10 percent better fuel economy than their 1976 California model. It uses a three-way catalyst system to achieve the emissions standards. The Engelhard Co. of New Jersey, which developed the catalyst system, is confident it could be adapted to American cars.

Responding to Volvo's breakthrough, Ford's Herbert Misch astounded members of Congress when he admitted: "We have been developing a three-way catalyst for some time and tentatively plan to introduce it in limited production in the 1978 model year."

Finally laying to rest the automaker's assertions of impossibility, the National Academy of Sciences has concluded that the statutory standards for hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide could definitely be met by 1978 and the standards for nitrogen oxides probably could be met. Note the year 1978. The proposals in Congress don't require the statutory standards until 1980 at the earliest.

In the face of such scientific opinion and

demonstrated ability, how can Detroit assert that the technology is unavailable? Philip Handler, president of the National Academy of Sciences, has one explanation: "There has been an apparent reluctance on the part of the manufacturers to assemble in a demonstration vehicle the component emissions control technologies which the manufacturers have in hand. In this way, they can maintain with some consistency that the required technology 'has not been demonstrated.'" In other words, the automakers have the technology, but they are unwilling to demonstrate it to anyone yet.

The National Academy of Sciences also has exploded the often-repeated myth that Detroit can't provide both the statutory standards and good fuel economy. The NAS Conference Report concludes that the 1978 statutory standards "could and should be achieved while improving fuel economy." In fact, the academy states the technology developed to reduce auto emissions may actually improve fuel economy as well. The 1977 California Volvo's 10 percent gain in fuel economy is an example of this improvement.

Moreover, these gas-saving, clean cars will not cost significantly more. A government study has estimated that the sticker price increase for a three-way catalyst system to meet the statutory standards would only be \$120. Volvo's increase is only \$50. Measured against the toll in deaths and illnesses under the current system, the small increase in sticker prices seems very worthwhile.

The last-ditch effort to weaken the automobile emissions requirements is riding on a proposed amendment by U.S. Rep. John Dingell of Michigan. This amendment would reset the statutory standards for nitrogen oxides at a much higher level and freeze them at the new level. It also would delay the hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide statutory standards until 1982.

The Dingell amendment represents a major retreat from the goals of the 1970 Clean Air Act and a grave threat to public health. In addition to the known health hazards from hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide, scientists have found a high statistical correlation between the number of cancer deaths and the level of concentration of nitrogen oxides. Recent evidence also suggests that nitrogen oxides are combining with other chemicals in the air to form nitrosamines, one of the most powerful cancer-producing agents known to man. It is imperative that Congress defeat the Dingell amendment to protect public health. This amendment is not only a health menace, it is patently unnecessary because the technology exists to provide cleaner cars.

Consumer and environmentalists are supporting an amendment which will be offered jointly by U.S. Reps. Henry Waxman of California and Andrew Maguire of New Jersey. The Waxman-Maguire amendment provides continual progress over the next few years in cleaning up the nation's autos, even though it postpones full compliance with the statutory standards until 1981. The amendment does not even require new interim technology. It merely imposes nationwide standards for 1978 equivalent to those now in effect in California. For 1979 and 1980, the amendment would require Federal standards to those being met by next year's California cars.

It is time to get the auto industry up and moving. Without the Waxman-Maguire interim compliance program, the automakers could sit on their hands for several years and then claim to be far behind schedule. They could then return to Congress and ask for further delays of the statutory standards. In addition to the opportunity for more delay, the cost in suffering from pushing back the Waxman-Maguire timetable would be great because millions of people would be unnecessarily exposed to higher levels of dangerous air pollutants.

DINGELL-BROYHILL (TRAIN) AUTO EMISSION AMENDMENT CITATIONS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as the Clean Air Act amendments, H.R. 10498, nears the floor for further consideration, I insert at this point for the benefit of my colleagues the citations in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of documentation supporting the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) auto emission control amendment to section 203 of the bill:

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD CITATIONS OF DOCUMENTATION SUPPORTING THE DINGELL-BROYHILL (TRAIN) AUTO EMISSION SCHEDULE AMENDMENT TO THE CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS, H.R. 10498

April 27, 1976, pages 11430-11436, FEA-EPA-DOT auto emission analysis.

May 11, 1976, pages 13453-13455, Dingell Dear Colleague, Dingell News Conference statement, and Dingell summary of FEA-EPA-DOT auto emission analysis.

May 24, 1976, pages 15243-15245, Dingell, Broyhill, and others, Dissenting Views re: auto emission standards, House Commerce Committee Report, H-Report 94-1175.

May 27, 1976, page 15885, Fuel-Efficient Automobiles Absolutely Necessary in Light of OPEC Threats of Higher Oil Prices.

June 11, 1976, page 17835, American Automobile Association Announces Support for the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) Automobile Emission Control Amendment to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1976.

July 26, 1976, pages 23761-23762, Auto Emission Test Corrected, re: California Air Resources Board and Governor Brown misleading claims on Volvo prototype test car emissions.

July 27, 1976, pages 24159-24160, Motor Vehicle Letter Comments on the Volvo Emissions Myth.

August 3, 1976, pages 25401, Commercial Travelers Support Dingell-Broyhill (Train) Amendment.

August 3, 1976, page 25395, Supporters Listed for Dingell-Broyhill (Train) Auto Emission Amendment.

August 3, 1976, page 25393, Railroads and Rail Labor Support Dingell-Broyhill (Train) Auto Emission Amendment.

August 3, 1976, page 25375, Administration Officers Write in Support of Dingell-Broyhill (Train) Auto Emission Amendment to the Pending Clean Air Bill.

August 3, 1976, pages 25379-25380, Administrator Train of EPA Writes in Support of Dingell-Broyhill (Train) Amendment to Clean Air Bill.

August 3, 1976, page 25388, IUE Supports Dingell-Broyhill (Train) Amendment to Clean Air Bill.

August 3, 1976, pages 25370-25372, Dingell-Broyhill (Train) Amendment printed.

August 4, 1976, page 25439 and pages 25451-25455, Congressman Dingell's floor statement upon opening of debate on Clean Air Acts Amendments, H.R. 10498 (auto emissions).

August 4, 1976, pages 25707-25710, The Dingell-Broyhill (Train) Auto Emission Control Amendment: A Response to Representative Paul Rogers.

August 10, 1976, pages 26971-26972, Imported Car Auto Dealers Clarify Position on Dingell-Broyhill (Train) Auto Emission Amendment to Clean Air Bill.

August 25, 1976, page 27799, Wall Street Journal Endorses the Dingell-Broyhill (Train) Standards.

August 26, page 28078, A response to the New York Times on Automobile Emission Controls.

RURAL ENERGY OFFICE

HON. CHARLES ROSE III

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to create within the Department of Agriculture an office specifically charged with the responsibility of assessing fuel and energy needs of people who live in rural America. This Rural Energy Office—REO—will serve those citizens who reside outside standard metropolitan statistical areas, looking to such needs as home heating and cooling, transportation, agriculture production, electrical generation, conservation, and research and development.

My colleague in the other body, Senator PATRICK LEAHY is introducing companion legislation today. I am indebted to Dr. Garrison Nelson, consultant to Senator LEAHY and professor at the University of Vermont, who has prepared the charts included in our presentation with the help of personnel at House Information Systems, and my legal counsel, Carol Forbes. We have always known that computers can be of great assistance in compiling information to help solve the many problems facing our Nation. It is particularly satisfying to us that Dr. Nelson has combined agricultural research and computer technology in this endeavor.

In May, Business Week declared that the major consequence of energy dislocations in recent years has been to accelerate population shifts in the direction of Southern and Western States and away from Northeastern and Midwestern ones. Shifts which the Census Bureau had predicted would take 10 years to accomplish have taken place in less than half of that time. And with population movements go the inevitable flows of talent and capital. It is this movement which Business Week sees as leading us to "the second war between the States."

Using materials from the Federal Energy Administration, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Highway Administration, the Bureau of Mines, and the Census Bureau, we have been able to develop the outlines of meaningful urban-rural differences in the consumption of petroleum products—the Nation's scarcest and most critical energy source.

The 10 States with the lowest metropolitan percentages are: Vermont, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho, Mississippi, Maine, Montana, New Mexico, and New Hampshire. These States had a per capita consumption of 352.8 gallons of distillate oil in 1974. This figure is 65 percent higher than the 214.2 gallons per capita of distillate consumed by all Americans in the same year.

Metropolitan States show a pattern similar to national consumption of distillate oil. The 10 most metropolitan States in 1973 were: New Jersey, California,

Rhode Island, New York, Connecticut, Maryland and the District of Columbia, Massachusetts, Florida, Michigan, and Hawaii. The 1974 per capita consumption of distillate oil in these States was 212.5 gallons, slightly less than that consumed in the United States as a whole, but 40

percent below that consumed in the least metropolitan States.

The following table is based upon each State's proportion of the national consumption of a petroleum product—distillate, residual, and motor gas—and is divided by each State's proportion of the

Nation's population. Thus, these figures represent the degree to which a State's consumption pattern of a petroleum product either exceeds or falls below the national average for that product. Each State's consumption ratio was ranked from 1 through 50 in this table:

TABLE 1.—PER CAPITA PETROLEUM CONSUMPTION: STATE RATIOS AND RANKINGS

FEA region/States	State ratios			Rankings		
	Distillate	Residual	Motor gas	Distillate	Residual	Gas
Region I—Boston:						
Connecticut	1.403	2.731	0.892	13	4	43
Maine	2.152	3.221	1.031	3	2	33
Massachusetts	1.989	2.640	.822	5	5	48
New Hampshire	1.809	1.308	1.004	8	13	35
Rhode Island	1.694	1.455	.824	10	11	47
Vermont	2.040	.252	1.041	4	39	30
Region II—New York:						
New York	1.158	1.860	.687	22	10	49
New Jersey	1.814	1.924	.899	7	9	42
Puerto Rico	Not included in study.					
Virgin Islands	Not included in study.					
Region III—Philadelphia:						
Pennsylvania	1.178	1.046	.844	21	17	46
Delaware	1.475	4.867	1.074	11	1	26
Maryland/District of Columbia	.997	2.105	.874	29	6	45
Virginia	1.016	1.937	1.032	28	8	32
West Virginia	.681	.211	.888	43	40	44
Region IV—Atlanta:						
Kentucky	.629	.137	1.037	46	44	31
Tennessee	.765	.047	1.037	40	49	17
North Carolina	.823	.569	1.031	37	30	18
South Carolina	.688	.759	1.086	45	19	21
Mississippi	1.201	.706	1.068	20	22	27
Alabama	.793	.648	1.081	38	28	23
Georgia	.787	.586	1.165	39	29	13
Florida	.536	2.058	1.079	48	7	24
Region V—Chicago:						
Illinois	.952	.566	.937	33	31	41
Indiana	1.329	.666	1.067	16	25	28
Michigan	.968	.361	1.041	32	33	29
Region VI—Dallas:						
Minnesota	1.226	.331	1.078	19	35	25
Ohio	.749	.171	.969	41	41	40
Wisconsin	1.114	.086	.975	23	47	38
Region VII—Kansas City:						
Arkansas	1.029	1.110	1.160	26	16	14
Louisiana	1.280	1.435	.968	17	12	39
New Mexico	1.334	.337	1.264	15	34	7
Oklahoma	.611	.088	1.283	47	46	5
Texas	.996	.694	1.223	34	23	8
Region VIII—Denver:						
Iowa	.992	.049	1.197	30	48	10
Kansas	.974	.259	1.215	31	38	9
Missouri	.715	.110	1.142	42	45	15
Nebraska	1.104	.149	1.168	24	43	12
Region IX—San Francisco:						
Colorado	.674	.281	1.082	44	36	22
Montana	2.038	.687	1.264	5	24	6
North Dakota	1.388	.413	1.342	14	32	4
South Dakota	1.030	.044	1.387	25	50	2
Utah	1.425	.808	1.090	12	16	19
Wyoming	3.736	1.284	1.701	1	14	1
Region X—Seattle:						
Alaska	3.658	.721	1.007	2	20	34
Idaho	1.761	.165	1.189	9	42	11
Oregon	1.274	.648	1.088	18	27	20
Washington	.922	.660	.995	35	26	36

Our perpetual energy crisis is not over for rural people. Prices for fertilizer, gasoline, insecticides, fuel oil, and gas continue to escalate as a result of international cartels and political maneuverings. In 1973, it took the equivalent of 80 gallons of gasoline to produce an acre of corn. Today it takes the equivalent of nearly 100 gallons. Many rural farms simply cannot pay the price for these gallons. Before too long, consumers may not be even able to pay for the food these farmers produce.

As American farmers are called on to produce greater and greater amounts of food, feed, and fiber for the world, they are shackled by the yoke of inflated energy costs. To feed our own population in the next 25 years, our agriculture's energy needs must increase 60 to 180 percent. To help feed that world's hungry people, that percentage will double. A farmer in Maryland recently said that the future of farming "always comes down to spending more of my dollars."

Yet in spite of these increased demands on energy for agriculture and rural areas, availability of resources for these areas has fallen. The Federal Energy Administration's "National Energy Outlook: 1976" contends that:

The reserves from which most of today's oil is being produced—mainly on-shore in the lower 48 states—will decline by almost two-thirds by 1985 and about 80% by 1990.

The natural gas situation in my home State of North Carolina in the last few years has been, at best, in a state of flux. Our citizens are continually subjected to threats of limited supplies or virtual cutoffs. As a result, some industries which rely heavily on a steady sup-

ply of this energy resource have sought more stable energy areas for their companies. Such activities perpetuate the problems of unemployment and poverty in rural areas and are directly related to energy problems.

Liquefied petroleum gas, LPG, is used by tobacco farmers to cure tobacco for market. The price for this commodity has gone nearly out of sight for farmers in my Seventh District. The 10 highest consumer States of LPG are rural States. Yet these citizens are being penalized as they struggle to keep pace with rising populations and demands for food and fiber.

Gasoline prices for cars and trucks and farm machinery in rural America have surpassed those for urban drivers because few independent companies can afford to establish businesses in remote rural areas. Rural citizens cannot choose between Good Gulf at 61 cents a gallon and Getty regular at 56 cents a gallon. Chances are, they will have to pay 65 cents a gallon at the Gulf station.

People living in the 10 least metropolitan States consumed 567 gallons of motor gasoline per capita in 1974. This figure is 31 percent higher than that for motor gasoline consumption in the 10 most metropolitan States and 18 percent higher than that for the Nation as a whole.

Comparisons among the States on their metropolitan percentages and per capita motor gasoline consumption indicate that as metropolitan percentages increase, motor gasoline consumption decreases.

A report from the nationwide personal transportation study, "Home to Work

Trips and Travel" reveals that people living in the Nation's unincorporated areas made 34 percent of the trips even though they constituted 26.5 percent of the population. In addition to making more trips, their trips are longer on the average. The average trip in the unincorporated areas was 11 miles, 28 percent higher than that recorded for the incorporated places—8.6 miles. Rural people have to make more trips because basic social services are not readily available to them.

And in spite of the inroads and income major oil companies have undoubtedly made in rural areas, several have announced they are pulling out of the markets which are great distances from their refineries. The areas hardest hit by these pullouts will be rural ones.

Mr. Speaker, rural Americans are caught in a vicious spiral when it comes to transportation. They do not have the advantages of a rapid transit system or computerized trains. The automobile is often the only way to get from one place to another.

And since most rural people are not wealthy, they cannot afford new, more efficient cars. Frequently, they must rely on secondhand cars which are often gas guzzlers.

In a like manner, in the area of home heating and cooling, rural residences are less efficient than most urban housing. In the first place, the units are usually single-family units and many of them are substandard. With one-fourth of the Nation's population, rural areas have 60 percent of the Nation's substandard housing. And these citizens do not have a choice between an apartment complex

and a well-insulated townhouse. Insulation repairs on an old house are exorbitant and often do not seem worth the price.

In North Carolina, we have the highest per capita consumption of kerosene for heating and we are No. 2 in the Nation for total use of kerosene. Even this relatively inexpensive petroleum byproduct is getting increasingly expensive to use. Inefficient and untidy, kerosene is used most often by the poor who do not have the opportunity or the money to switch their furnaces to oil.

The next three tables take all of the States and divide their consumption patterns into three groups: High, ranks 1 to 16; medium, ranks 17 to 34; and low, ranks 35 to 50. In this way it was possible to identify which States ranked high in consumption of one petroleum product and low in the consumption of another.

Two simple measures of association were used to determine the degree of relationship between the petroleum consumption patterns—Spearman's rho which compared each States ranking on each product and Goodman and Kruskal's gamma which compared the consumption patterns within State groups. The results for each measure are presented below:

TABLE 2.—STATE PER CAPITA PETROLEUM CONSUMPTION
1974 SALES OF DISTILLATE FUEL AND RESIDUAL FUEL

Residual fuel sales			
Distillate fuel sales	High (States 1 to 16)	Medium (States 17 to 34)	Low (States 35 to 50)
High (States 1 to 16)	Connecticut, 88.7. Delaware, 69.6. Maine, 23.8. Massachusetts, 86.8. New Hampshire, 36.1. New Jersey, 93.3. Rhode Island, 91.1. Wyoming, 0.0.	Alaska, 44.2. Indiana, 64.3. Montana, 24.4. New Mexico, 34.2. North Dakota, 12.4. Utah, 79.2.	Idaho, 16.5. Vermont, 0.0.
	Mean=61.1.	Mean=43.1.	Mean=8.2.
Medium (States 17 to 34)	Arkansas, 40.8. Louisiana, 64.6. Maryland/District of Columbia, 87.7. New York, 88.8. Virginia, 66.0.	Arizona, 74.4. Illinois, 81.5. Michigan, 82.0. Mississippi, 22.3. Oregon, 60.6. Pennsylvania, 80.8. Texas, 77.0.	Iowa, 36.8. Kansas, 43.2. Minnesota, 63.2. Nebraska, 44.5. South Dakota, 14.4. Wisconsin, 57.9.
	Mean=69.6.	Mean=68.4.	Mean=43.3.
Low (States 35 to 50)	California, 93.1. Florida, 83.9. Hawaii, 81.6.	Alabama, 63.8. Georgia, 56.7. North Carolina, 45.6. South Carolina, 47.9. Washington, 71.9.	Colorado, 72.5. Kentucky, 48.3. Missouri, 64.2. Nevada, 75.1. Ohio, 80.3. Oklahoma, 55.6. Tennessee, 62.5. West Virginia, 37.1.
	Mean=86.2.	Mean=62.0.	Mean=57.2.

NOTE.—Resident metropolitan percentages, 1973. Distillate/residual: gamma=+.449.

Source: Distillate sales, 1974 and residual sales, 1974, both from the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines. Metropolitan percentages from the Department of Commerce, the Census Bureau.

CXXII—1810—Part 22

Spearman's rho
Goodman & Kruskal's gamma

Distillate and residual fuels.....	+0.326	+0.449
Distillate and motor gas.....	-.063	+.041
Residual and motor gas.....	-.493	-.526

What these correlations indicate is that States which have higher rates of distillate consumption also have higher rates of residual consumption. However, there was no relationship between States with high rates of distillate consumption and those with high rates of motor gasoline consumption.

The strongest relationship of the three is a negative one. States with high rates of residual fuel consumption very often have low rates of motor gas consumption and vice versa. It is this relationship which is most pertinent to the question of the Rural Energy Office for it is along the high residual/low motor gas versus low residual/high motor gas dimension where urban and rural States differ the most.

These data appear in table 4. Also included in this table and the two preceding ones are 1973 metropolitan percentages of each State's resident population. With this information added, the urban-rural character of the relationship can be easily discerned. A summary is presented below:

TABLE 3.—STATE PER CAPITA PETROLEUM CONSUMPTION
1974 SALES OF DISTILLATE FUEL AND MOTOR GASOLINE

Motor gasoline sales			
Distillate fuel sales	High (States 1 to 16)	Medium (States 17 to 34)	Low (States 35 to 50)
High (States 1 to 16)	Idaho, 16.5. Montana, 24.4. New Mexico, 34.2. North Dakota, 12.4. Wyoming, 0.0.	Alaska, 44.2. Delaware, 69.6. Indiana, 64.3. Maine, 23.8. Utah, 79.2. Vermont, 0.0.	Connecticut, 88.7. Massachusetts, 86.8. New Hampshire, 36.1. New Jersey, 93.3. Rhode Island, 91.1.
	Mean=17.5.	Mean=46.8.	Mean=79.2.
Medium (States 17 to 34)	Arizona, 74.4. Arkansas, 40.8. Iowa, 36.8. Kansas, 43.2. Nebraska, 44.5. South Dakota, 14.4. Texas, 77.0.	Michigan, 82.0. Minnesota, 63.2. Mississippi, 22.3. Oregon, 60.6. Virginia, 66.0.	Illinois, 81.5. Louisiana, 64.6. Maryland/District of Columbia, 87.7. New York, 88.8. Pennsylvania, 80.8. Wisconsin, 57.9.
	Mean=47.3.	Mean=58.8.	Mean=76.9.
Low (States 35 to 50)	Georgia, 56.7. Missouri, 64.2. Nevada, 75.1. Oklahoma, 55.6.	Alabama, 63.8. Colorado, 72.5. Florida, 83.9. Kentucky, 48.3. North Carolina, 45.6. South Carolina, 47.9. Tennessee, 62.5.	California, 93.1. Hawaii, 81.6. Ohio, 80.3. Washington, 71.9. West Virginia, 37.1.
	Mean=62.9.	Mean=60.6.	Mean=72.8.

NOTE.—Resident metropolitan percentages, 1973. Distillate/Motor Gas: gamma=+.041.

Source: Distillate sales, 1974 from the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines. Motor gasoline sales, 1974 from the Department of Transportation. Metropolitan percentages from the Department of Commerce, Census Bureau.

Petroleum consumption patterns	Number of States	Mean metropolitan population (percent)
High residual/low motor gas.....	10	81.2
High residual/medium motor gas.....	4	60.8
Medium residual/low motor gas.....	3	78.1
Low residual/high motor gas.....	8	43.8
Low residual/medium motor gas.....	5	49.5
Medium residual/high motor gas.....	6	46.5

Seventeen States show an urban-industrial petroleum consumption pattern while 19 States show a rural-agricultural one. Given the lack of industry and population concentrations, the rural-agricultural States have a far lesser need for residual fuel. They have few factories to run; no major chemical plants; and no huge oil-fired electrical generating facilities. The rural areas rely more upon hydroelectric power, coal, and more recently, nuclear energy.

The high motor gasoline consumption ratios in the rural-agricultural States are a natural consequence of greater distances to travel, the lack of nearby social services, and the absence of sizable mass transit systems. Table 4 captures the essence of the rural energy problem.

Tables 2, 3, and 4 follow:

TABLE 4.—STATE PER CAPITA PETROLEUM CONSUMPTION
1974 SALES OF RESIDUAL FUEL AND MOTOR GASOLINE

Motor gasoline sales				Residual fuel	High (States 1 to 16)	Medium (States 17 to 34)	Low (States 35 to 50)
Residual fuel	High (States 1 to 16)	Medium (States 17 to 34)	Low (States 35 to 50)	Medium (States 17 to 34)	High (States 1 to 16)	Medium (States 17 to 34)	Low (States 35 to 50)
High (States 1 to 16)	Arkansas, 40.8. Wyoming, 0.0.	Delaware, 69.6. Florida, 83.9. Maine, 23.8. Virginia, 66.0.	California, 93.1. Connecticut, 88.7. Hawaii, 81.6. Louisiana, 64.6. Maryland/District of Columbia, 87.7. Massachusetts, 86.8. New Hampshire, 36.1. New Jersey, 93.3. New York, 88.8. Rhode Island, 91.1.	Arizona, 74.4. Georgia, 56.7. Montana, 24.4. New Mexico, 34.2. North Dakota, 12.4. Texas, 77.0.	Alabama, 63.8. Alaska, 44.2. Indiana, 64.3. Michigan, 82.0. Mississippi, 22.3. North Carolina, 45.6. Oregon, 60.6. South Carolina, 47.9. Utah, 79.2.	Illinois, 81.5. Pennsylvania, 80.8. Washington, 71.9.	
	Mean=20.4.	Mean=60.8.	Mean=81.2.	Mean=46.5.	Mean=46.5.	Mean=56.7.	Mean=78.1.
				Low (States 35 to 50)	Idaho, 16.5. Iowa, 36.8. Kansas, 43.2. Missouri, 64.2. Nebraska, 44.5. Nevada, 75.1. Oklahoma, 55.6. South Dakota, 14.4.	Colorado, 72.5. Kentucky, 48.3. Minnesota, 63.2. Tennessee, 62.5. Vermont, 0.0.	Ohio, 80.3. West Virginia, 37.1. Wisconsin, 57.9.
				Mean=43.8.	Mean=43.8.	Mean=49.3.	Mean=58.4.

NOTE.—Resident metropolitan percentages 1973.

Source: Residual sales, 1974 from the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines; Motor gasoline sales, 1974 from the Department of Transportation; and metropolitan percentages from the Department of Commerce, Census Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, at every turn of the road, rural Americans suffer energy deprivation not experienced by the rest of America's people. Those among us who provide the food we eat and clothes we wear are now being penalized for providing these services and we must help them.

Our study of petroleum consumption reveals that there is no rural-urban difference in the per capita consumption total of motor gasoline and residual fuel combined. The 10 most metropolitan States had a per capita consumption of 742 gallons of residual and gasoline combined in 1974, while the 10 least metropolitan States had a per capita consumption of 735 gallons. While the total consumption figures are virtually identical, the residual versus motor gas components are not. In the 10 least metropolitan States, residual fuel represents only 23 percent of the combined total while in the 10 most metropolitan States residual fuel represents 42 percent.

What this means simply is that any conservation effort which seeks only to reduce motor gas consumption in order to create greater supplies of residual fuel is an urban solution. The rural areas will not benefit from the increased availability of residual fuel. They will in fact be hurt by the decrease in the available supply of motor gasoline.

The 10 States which rank highest in the Nation in their per capita consumption of residual fuel and which rank lowest in their per capita consumption of motor gasoline have a mean metropolitan percentage of 81.2. The eight States which rank lowest in residual consumption and highest in motor gas consumption have a metropolitan mean of 43.8 percent.

At no point does the urban-rural factor in petroleum consumption become clearer. The tradeoff between using crude oil for residual fuel or for motor

gasoline raises fundamental questions about the future of American lifestyles.

The shameful result of these energy-related trends in rural areas is that fewer and fewer Americans can afford to live there and own farms. Today most people living in rural areas are not farmers and those who are earn the majority of their income in nonagricultural employment.

As the number of family farms dwindles and the number of corporate farms increases, energy needs also increase. Corporation agriculture is energy intensive rather than labor intensive, and if these farmers cannot have access to fuel supplies at costs competitive with urban industries, our Nation may reverse itself as a producer and exporter of food and become a consumer and importer of food.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe that a Rural Energy Office in the Department of Agriculture would greatly improve the flow of information regarding energy for rural citizens. And passage of this bill will demonstrate that the Congress of the United States, representing rural people in every state, is making a sincere effort to serve them.

The REO will be charged with the responsibility of assessing the fuel and energy needs of rural residents as those needs pertain to home heating and cooling, transportation, agricultural production, electrical generation, conservation, and research and development.

The office will have two functions. First, it will gather information. Contained within the Offices of the Agricultural Research Service, Economic Research Service, Rural Electrification Administration, Agricultural Marketing Service, Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service, Cooperative State Research Service, Extension Service, Forest Service, National Agriculture Library, Soil Conservation Service, and

the Statistical Reporting Service are individuals who have extensive knowledge of the rural areas most likely to be affected by changes in the availability of various energy sources. They are also well aware of the concerns of rural residents regarding energy.

Mr. Speaker, we are not advocating the establishment of a new bureaucracy. The Federal Energy Administration has a mandate to oversee the energy needs of all Americans, but we believe that rural citizens have been overlooked in this area. Besides, an office within the Department of Agriculture which already mobilizes such expertise will not require a huge expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

The Secretary of Agriculture will then direct and transfer those USDA statisticians and economists who are already engaged in matters related to energy, and have them concentrate their efforts in assessing the full dimensions of energy needs facing rural people.

The second function of the REO will be to serve as a clearinghouse for energy legislation likely to have a direct impact on rural citizens and industries. Those energy experts within REO will be directed to look for alternative approaches and consequences as well, and they will be encouraged to initiate legislation when appropriate.

This bill addresses seven specific energy areas. The first is home heating and cooling methods. Rural residents hear little or nothing about improved insulation techniques and materials. Solar and wind energy experiments pass them by. Yet rural homes are often situated in areas which have long sunlight hours and where wind currents are strong and sunlight concentrated. The REO will be responsible for making information on current heating and cooling research available to residents in rural areas.

Second, the bill directs the REO to assess the energy needs related to transportation in rural areas: How much gasoline is needed? Is it available? Which areas are to be cut off from supply? When? What will be the impact of such withdrawal? And can the supply of gasoline be met by others?

Third, the REO will be required to provide information related to the production of agricultural commodities, such as LP gases, insecticides, fertilizers, and to assess the impact of fluctuating prices on rural areas.

Fourth, information on energy needs for business and industry in rural America will be sought. How can new industries be encouraged to invest in underdeveloped rural areas, and how can those already there be maintained? Can energy needs be met to sustain economic growth in rural areas?

Fifth, the REO is charged with acquiring information on the sources of electricity—where it is generated, what the long-term needs are likely to be, what the future of nuclear plants is in rural areas. And what the costs will be to residents.

Sixth, the bill directs the REO to develop information on conservation of energy, to inform rural people of conservation methods, and to develop programs encouraging energy self-sufficiency.

And finally, the REO is charged with doing research to identify and develop information on alternative fuels and the potential of energy technologies which have not been fully developed or widely used.

Mr. Speaker, the successful production of food and fiber is based on meeting the energy requirements of agriculture. The strength of rural America is based on the fabric of family farms and rugged individualists who rely on energy and fuel to make a living from the land. We render these citizens powerless when we do not meet their needs.

Fuel is the life blood of our agricultural society. Without it, the Nation cannot survive. Today, through the penalties of high prices and lack of information, this delicate system is suffering from hardening of the arteries. If we do not give it a transfusion, it may not be able to do what we know it must do if we are to maintain our standard of living.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues in this Chamber to join me in support of a Rural Energy Office. Identical legislation is being introduced in the other body by Senator LEAHY of Vermont. If implemented as we intend, this office could provide the missing link in our long overdue rural development effort.

To rural Americans, information about energy is as important as information about soil or weather or water levels or markets. And it is high time we give our valiant citizens the sort of service they require in this critical area of their lives.

In the course of research for this bill, we developed data on per capita consumption ratios of the three major petroleum products: Distillate oil, residual fuel, and motor gasoline. The sources for this data were: "Sales of Fuel Oil and Kerosene in 1974," Mineral Indus-

try Surveys, Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, 1975; "Monthly Motor Gasoline Reported by States," Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, 1975; "Preliminary 1974 Power Production, Capacity, Fuel Consumption Data," Washington, D.C., Federal Power Commission, 1975; and "Estimates of the Population of States: July 1, 1973 and 1974," Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1974.

Other sources used in the preparation of the data were two publications of the Federal Energy Administration, "Project Independence Report," November 1974, and the "National Energy Outlook," February 1976; two reports from the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, "Agriculture and the Fuel Crisis," 1974, and "Energy Crisis and Its Effect on Agriculture," 1973; and one from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the U.S. Senate, "The Effects of Uncertain Energy Supplies on Rural Economic Development," 1974. In addition, valuable information on this subject could be found in the series of reports prepared by the Congressional Research Service entitled "Toward a National Growth Policy: Federal and State Developments," 1972-75.

AUGUST 30 ACCIDENT AT HANFORD

HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, yesterday morning, August 30, about 3 a.m., there was a small localized explosion inside chemical processing equipment involving waste recovery at the Hanford, Wash., plant of the Energy Research and Development Administration. This was not a nuclear accident, and it did not occur at a nuclear powerplant. It had nothing to do with nuclear energy production or the fabrication or reprocessing of nuclear fuels. The explosion was probably caused by a chemical reaction, and occurred in an americium recovery facility. The operator received superficial cuts on the face and on one side, and was contaminated by the americium solution.

Americium is a radioactive element used in industrial measuring. It does not require heavy shielding, but does require contamination control. It was, therefore, necessary, after the operator had showered, for him to go to the Hanford Environmental Health Facility, a special industrial-medical unit in Richland which treats cases where the skin has been broken and where there is probable contamination. There were nine other persons involved, who were contaminated, one of them significantly, in assisting the operator in leaving the room and in decontaminating him. Eight of these men were decontaminated by washing, and have been released. One is being held for

further decontamination, as is the contaminated operator. The room in which the facility is located was contaminated, and will require extensive decontamination. There was no significant contamination outside the building.

It is apparent that the significance and magnitude of this accident has been exaggerated by the way it has been handled by some elements of the press. If this accident had occurred in some nonnuclear facility, it would not have been reported at all by the press, but if strong acids or caustics or certain organic or inflammable materials had splashed on the operator in such an accident in a nonnuclear facility, the accident would have been far more serious. The accident, while regrettable, has no impact on the Hanford plant, nor on the nuclear energy program.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

HON. LEO J. RYAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious from the number of complaints I have received from the 11th Congressional District of California that the operation of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration is a major source of aggravation and resentment toward the Federal Government for many American businessmen. I know from personal experience that many of the criticisms are justified.

OSHA's penchant for enforcing trivial and petty regulations have consistently taken precedent over the more serious dangers facing American workers. I think it is important to note that 98 percent of the 1 million citations issued by OSHA have been for "nonserious violations." This record is a disservice to the goal of protecting the real welfare of the working men and women of America and a constant irritation to the American businessman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer the following reply to one such comment on OSHA which may be of interest to my colleagues of the Congress:

DEAR NFIB MEMBER: Since my election to the United States Congress four years ago, I have been besieged by complaints concerning the operation of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and I suspect many of those complaints have been justified.

Instead of addressing major problems of health and safety, the agency has all too often directed its attention toward areas which could best be served by local fire departments or state public health services. Rather than control worker exposure to dangerous chemicals such as benzene which has been tied to leukemia, the agency has all too frequently used its limited resources for measuring the distance between aisles in the local hardware store or handing out citations at the neighborhood garage because the coffee pot doesn't have the proper kind of plug. Congress had no intention of injecting the federal government in many of

these areas and yet it bears the brunt of much of the small business communities aggravation with OSHA's regulation.

In the last 3½ years for example, OSHA inspectors have issued almost 1 million citations to employers for violations. 98 percent of these have been for "non-serious violations" as defined by OSHA. The average penalty is \$25. I doubt that the threat of such a small fine adds to an employer's willingness to comply with the regulations. I think such fines serve to breed disrespect for the law and a government which seems to delight in unnecessarily questioning the good intentions of those it is supposed to serve.

Last year the House began to address the serious problems and resentment OSHA was generating. On November 17, 1975, the House passed and sent to the Senate HR 8618, a bill which would provide onsite consultation for OSHA standards, a major complaint of many employers. Only fifteen Members of the House voted against this bill which has not yet been considered by the other body.

Recently I talked with Congressman David Obey (D-Wisc) and other Members of the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee who explained the strong action the Subcommittee had taken in the 1976 Labor-HEW budget. I want you as a businessman to be aware of the new policies OSHA has been directed to follow:

(1) Immediate steps to dramatically upgrade the skills of OSHA inspectors through intensive retraining. This retraining should be conducted irrespective of a possible reduction in the number of inspections completed during the coming year and should accomplish the following objectives:

(a) provide each inspector with a clear sense of priorities as to which workplace hazards pose the greatest threat to the health and well-being of workers

(b) provide inspection procedures to insure that citations, fines, and abatement orders are based on those priorities

(c) provide a clear understanding of the meaning of each OSHA standard by all inspectors and develop the technical skills necessary to concentrate enforcement efforts on workplace hazards which pose the greatest threat to the well-being of the workers, particularly in the area of health

(2) Review and simplification of existing OSHA standards and elimination of so-called "nuisance standards" or standards which do not deal with workplace conditions that are clearly hazardous to the health or safety of workers or are more properly under the jurisdiction of State Departments of Public Health.

(3) Redirection of enforcement programs to place increased emphasis on problems related to worker health. The Congress notes that the overwhelming number of inspections have been in the field of safety despite reports by the Administration that deaths due to occupational health problems exceed 100,000 per year while problems involving safety account for 11,000 deaths per year.

(4) Substantial redirection of inspection efforts away from industries with good worker health and safety records so as to permit increased inspection in industries with the greatest health and safety problems.

(5) Development of fine-free on-site consultation programs which are available to employers throughout the United States are clearly understood by employers and are staffed by competent consultants qualified to advise employers of the application of OSHA standards in their workplace. An evaluation of the on-site consultation program shall be completed and transmitted to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

With regard to the second directive above, OSHA has complained that its efforts to revise section 6(a) standards, have been

thwarted by a general lack of data upon which to base proposals or revisions more relevant to employee safety and health. It is my understanding that the agency continues to encourage interested parties to participate in the revision process by submitting written comments. I would also like to encourage you to participate because it is important to the small business community and the American economy that we minimize the damage being done by OSHA. Please make your comments available to:

Director, Office of Standards Development, OSHA, U.S. Department of Labor, Room N-3718, 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20210.

To make sure comments are directed to the appropriate officials, those on walking-working surfaces should be directed to Docket D; Fire Protection, Docket L; and Anhydrous Ammonia, Docket AA.

While I have serious doubts about the effectiveness of OSHA in furthering the goal of safeguarding the working men and women of America, as long as the agency continues to exist I intend to do what I can to make its standards and procedures more rational than they have been in the past.

Sincerely yours,

LEO J. RYAN,
Member of Congress.

NADER IN CHARGE?

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the recent news from Georgia concerned the Democratic standard bearer's receiving Ralph Nader as his visitor to his recently established political court. Following their meeting, according to news stories, both Governor Carter and Mr. Nader took turns in spreading compliments thick as peanut butter.

In view of this Carter-Nader mutual admiration club, I think it appropriate to bring to the attention of my colleagues two recent editorial commentaries, one from the Wall Street Journal and the other from the Washington Post, which reflect criticism indicating a growing disenchantment with scattershot Nader attacks on American industry.

In former times Mr. Nader has been made to appear an irreproachable defender of consumer interests. These editorials from the Journal and the Post point up a sharp change in attitude.

I commend the reading of these editorials to my colleagues, as well as Governor Carter and his staff:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 5, 1976]

CAUSE AND CURE OF CANCER DISCOVERED

While the U.S. government has already dumped \$3 billion into the "war on cancer," a Washington lawyer with no medical credentials working with limited financial resources has located a leading source of cancer. Browsing through hearings of the Senate Commerce Committee held earlier this summer, we note that Mr. Ralph Nader disclosed, "Corporations are a cause of cancer."

Because Mr. Nader has occasionally taken issue with our comments on his myriad activities and because we aspire to be at least as accurate as the studies that bear his imprimatur, we quote the relevant part of his statement:

"In the public health area, health specialists are beginning to be concerned about cancer as an environmentally caused disease. That means pollution, carcinogenic drugs, food additives, cigarettes, and the like; all of which are developed, promoted, carelessly handled by corporations, including the relentless promotion to make millions of Americans addicted to cigarettes. Even the addiction area, in substantial part, can be laid at the door of these companies. So that the phrase 'corporate carcinogenesis' is beginning to come into play. Corporations are a cause of cancer."

This is a remarkable breakthrough. The bulk of the medical profession, perhaps influenced by sinister forces, holds that there are statistical correlations between certain industrial and consumer activities and cancer, but still lacks a credible theory of what makes body cells go tumorous.

Not content with discovering a cause of malignant neoplasms, Mr. Nader also offers a cure. To wit, in the name of public health, Congress should legislate the federal chartering of corporations.

Well, that should be easy enough. But Mr. Nader's prognosis raises a few questions. After all, it was the Royalty Chartered Virginia Company that introduced tobacco to the world. The historians are silent about what corporation promoted nicotine addiction among the Indians, who taught it to the Europeans. Also, a Czechoslovak medical journal reports the Soviet cancer rate to be approximately the same as the U.S.; the Soviet Embassy advises us there are no corporations in the U.S.S.R.

It occurs to us that those epidemiologists working day and night in Philadelphia could save themselves a lot of trouble by calling in Mr. Nader. By his logic, clearly, the Pennsylvania mystery disease is caused by veterans' conventions.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 6, 1976]

WINDEAGS AND AIRBAGS

There seems to have been a certain amount of windbagery at the air bag hearings held by Secretary of Transportation William T. Coleman on Tuesday. At issue was a decision Secretary Coleman has promised to make by January 1: whether or not automobile manufacturers should be compelled to install air bags (or other "passive restraints," as they are known) on all new cars as a safety measure. Over the years the air bag argument has been very intense. Both the cost and the prospective efficacy of the device have been at issue between manufacturers and consumer groups. Thus Secretary Coleman, a public official known for his willingness to assume personal responsibility for tough and politically controversial decisions and for a corollary insistence on getting all the facts he can, delayed a ruling until he could acquire a wide range of information. Tuesday's hearing was part of the process.

The windbagery was initiated by Ralph Nader, whose commitment to the mandatory installation of air bags seemed to have overwhelmed both his judgment and his ability to deal straightforwardly. In his prepared statement, Mr. Nader sought to rig the game and also to personalize it in a particularly offensive way. He did so by suggesting that the real issue was Mr. Coleman's character, the idea being that the Secretary was in fact in the process of deciding whether or not to sell out, as distinct from deciding the merits of the case. But hear Mr. Nader:

It really boils down to whether you have the moral fortitude to stand up to the giant auto corporations and the White House that has serviced them so faithfully in the last few years. That is the issue . . . It is whether William T. Coleman has the guts to stand up to General Motors and the Ford Motor Co. as he had the guts to stand up on civil

rights years ago—and, after too many months, to stand up soon, before, not after the November elections.

Mr. Nader had already suggested that the hearing was being used as a means of delaying a final ruling, prompting Mr. Coleman to interrupt with the observation that he didn't much care to have the "integrity" of the process impugned in this fashion. There was also a flare-up over Mr. Nader's reference to Secretary Coleman's feelings about "rights for black people," which he had brought up in a ham-handed way, prompting Secretary Coleman liken him to "bigoted people"—a term for which the Secretary subsequently apologized on the grounds that in his job he should not "irritate" citizens.

Not very pleasant, you will probably agree; but the point is larger than that. It is that Mr. Nader's insinuations of bad faith, which ran in an unmistakable, if elusive, undercurrent through his statement, were inappropriate, unnecessary and unwise. In the particular case this is so because Secretary Coleman is a public official of demonstrated integrity and courage. Unsupported suggestions that he is not are genuinely reckless. More generally we would just observe that loose insinuations about a public official's character are no more defensible or attractive than similar assertions about—let us say—his loyalty to his country. It has always struck us as odd that so many of the well-intended folks on the left who understand one half of this proposition don't seem to understand the other. Mr. Nader, in this episode, is a case in point. We would remind him that the issue is the efficacy of the air bag, not the potential corruption of Mr. Coleman. Very possibly we will disagree with the Secretary's final judgment on the matter ourselves. But we have not the smallest reservation about the objectivity and good faith with which he will reach it. Neither should Mr. Nader.

FORD'S PARK PLAN TOO LITTLE TOO LATE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. I was pleased to learn this past weekend of President Ford's proposal to establish a 10-year, \$1.5 billion program designed to preserve and protect the natural and historic treasures that are embodied in our national park system. The President's program would double the size of the Nation's park, wildlife refuge, and recreation areas, and provide nearly \$500 million for improved maintenance and increased staffing which is so desperately needed.

The House Government Operations Subcommittee on Conservation, Energy and Natural Resources, which I chaired until 3 months ago, conducted an extensive investigation on the effects of personnel and budgetary shortages imposed upon the Park Service. We learned that park buildings, roads, bridges, trails, and historic sites were not being maintained according to the Park Service's own standards.

In June of this year the House Government Operations Committee unanimously approved a report based on the subcommittee's investigation, recom-

mending that Congress increase the National Park Service budget and that the OMB increase the ceiling on permanent personnel for the Park Service to a level equivalent to that authorized by Congress. The committee felt that this would be the quickest and most economical way to halt the degradation of America's national parks. It is for this reason that I commend that portion of the President's appropriations request which, if approved, would provide \$194.3 million for the Park Service for maintenance, and \$200 million for an additional 1,000 positions for the Nation's parks over the next 10 years. Although the President's request also provides \$700 million for development of new and existing park areas and \$141 million for acquisition of new park land, it is essential that more money be earmarked for maintenance of existing facilities, some of which are shamefully inadequate, rather than for construction of new facilities.

The President's recent action is both commendable and long overdue. For 8 years now indifference and neglect have been the hallmark of Republican administrations that have passively watched the continuing degradation of our Nation's parks. The President's 10-year program represents an important commitment to the preservation of the scenic, historical, and cultural values that are an integral part of our national park system. It is unfortunate, however, that the President's sudden interest in the Nation's resource protection problems had not been displayed sometime before the end of a legislative session and prior to the deterioration that has already taken its toll on visitor services and facilities within our national parks.

WIRETAP SURVEILLANCE

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that my colleagues will be interested in a bill (S. 3197, H.R. 12750) which is being rushed to enactment by the Senate. This bill would permit the wiretap surveillance of aliens and others who are not engaged in criminal activity, but whose conversations are deemed relevant to the plans of the State Department.

This bill has been vigorously advanced by Attorney General Edward Levi and the administration.

The attached editorial from the Boston Globe of August 28, 1976, another editorial from the New York Times of August 29, 1976, as well as an excellent article by Tom Wicker in the New York Times on August 31, 1976, show the serious inadequacies and indeed the perniciousness of this proposal.

These items follow:

[From the Boston Globe, Aug. 28, 1976]

HALFWAY ON WIRETAPS

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy's bill to regulate national-security wiretapping, which previously would have given the government broad authority to tap citizens not accused

of any crime, has been improved by the Senate Judiciary and Intelligence committees.

But the bill, cosponsored by President Ford, retains at least three provisions that encroach needlessly on civil liberties.

Most easily remedied is the section that still permits non-criminal wiretap warrants, but only against agents of foreign intelligence networks who are clandestinely transmitting information to a foreign power and apparently violating national security.

That kind of activity is equivalent to criminal espionage, and ought to be regulated. Nonetheless, as the Church-Schweiker committee warned after reviewing FBI and CIA crimes, the government should never be allowed to tap citizens who are not breaking the law. If the government needs to wiretap foreign intelligence agents, why not amend the espionage laws to make such activity specifically a crime?

More troublesome is the procedure for obtaining wiretap warrants. While the mere fact of requiring a warrant—and the written record the warrant provides—offer a vast improvement over warrantless and untraceable taps, the bill virtually compels a judge to issue a warrant without real opportunity to consider whether the intrusion of a wiretap is justified. The bill allows the government to go to any of seven designated judges or to two levels of appeal. Some greater measure of judicial discretion would not delay or deny the relatively small number of justifiable taps.

The greatest weakness of the bill, and another contradiction of the Church-Schweiker recommendations, is an indirect acknowledgement that the President may have authority to install taps without warrants and outside the law. Technically the bill is neutral on the question—but it mentions the possibility that such an authority may exist, instead of leaving the issue unspoken and up to the courts.

Some proponents of executive privilege claim not even the Supreme Court can control the President's wiretapping for national security, because surveillance is an executive function. To us it is clear that every wiretap, of a gambler or an organized crime leader or a spy, is an infringement of civil liberties which are constitutionally guaranteed and protected by the courts, and that taps can be justified only when legal evidence suggests an ongoing crime.

The Senate committees have recognized the need to control wiretapping and have produced a better bill. Further amendments would reassure all except the few who believe any wiretap violates the Bill of Rights—and those few must recognize that wiretapping will not be stopped and should be controlled.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 29, 1976]
MOVING TOO FAST

Senator Edward M. Kennedy is working hard to rush the new national security wiretap legislation through the Senate. The measure, designed to impose order and restraint on wiretapping activities in areas where there have been no legislative restrictions in the past, was originally developed by a bipartisan group of Senators on the Judiciary Committee and by the Attorney General. After the bill had been considered by both the Judiciary Committee and the new Select Committee on Intelligence, Senator Kennedy, with apparent impatience, attempted to schedule it on a highly expedited basis with severely limited debate on Monday.

A long list of abuses has been rationalized by incantation of "national security." The first legislative effort to curb such practices is bound to be sensitive and fraught with uncertainty. For example, the proposed measure is marred by at least one major flaw: It authorizes wiretapping in instances which lack proof of crime or a showing of probable

cause that a crime has been or is about to be committed. This runs counter to the explicit recommendation of the Church committee that such a showing be the basis of authorizing wiretaps. Senator Walter Mondale, chairman of the Church committee's task force on domestic intelligence, testified before the intelligence committee for two hours in opposition to this measure.

The one lesson that should have impressed the Congress after the long months of intelligence investigations and disclosures is that American citizens suffered from abuses precisely because Congress failed to do its job diligently. Rushing to a decision on so sensitive a bill without full debate and consideration would seem to suggest more of the same lack of diligence.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 31, 1976]

A BILL THAT CAN WAIT

(By Tom Wicker)

The Senate is about to debate Attorney General Edward Levi's national security wiretapping bill, so it's necessary once again to ask the question: What emergency justifies a Democratic Congress in rushing to pass a Republican Administration bill so full of loopholes and ambiguities? Why shouldn't such an important matter be left to the next Congress, when either the Carter-Mondale Administration will be in office or the Ford Administration will have been given electoral legitimacy?

The general subject of protecting citizens' rights while still maintaining the national security, as a matter of fact, might usefully be discussed in the Carter-Ford debates apparently to take place during the fall campaign. That Walter Mondale, the Democratic Vice-Presidential nominee, has been one of the strongest opponents of the Levi wiretapping bill (S. 3197) is another good reason for a Democratic Congress to let this measure wait on the election returns.

It is depressing, moreover, that the first official act of the new Senate intelligence committee, set up with such fanfare to provide "oversight" of the F.B.I., the C.I.A., and other security agencies, should have been to clear the Levi bill. The committee did make improvements in the text that came to it from the Senate Judiciary Committee, but the two principal deficiencies of the measures—and many of its lesser ones—remain. On this showing, the intelligence committee is off to a weak start, although it is not the committee that is pushing for a quick passage.

It has reported a bill which, even as amended, would permit the wiretap surveillance of American citizens who are not engaged in criminal activity. And it has not fully rectified a provision of that bill that disclaims any intent "to affect the exercise of any constitutional power the President may have subject to determination by the courts to acquire foreign intelligence information."

Thus, S. 3197 implicitly confirms the idea that there is or may be some "inherent power" in the Presidency to acquire foreign intelligence information without even such restrictions as the bill provides, if "the facts and circumstances . . . are so unprecedented and potentially harmful to the nation that they cannot reasonably be said to have been within the contemplation of Congress." If a court determined that a President in such circumstances had acted unconstitutionally, the action would already have taken place and the damage would be done.

That is not only a loophole alert Americans should not wish to hand such a President as, say, Richard Nixon. It also directly contravenes one of the most important recommendations of the Church committee, which spent more than a year studying intelligence abuses and was the parent of the present Senate intelligence committee.

The Church panel's Recommendation One was stark in its simplicity: "There is no inherent constitutional authority for the President or any intelligence agency to violate the law." The accompanying report specifically cited "warrantless electronic surveillance" as an activity for which there was no inherent Constitutional authority and said: "Statutes enacted pursuant to these recommendations should provide the exclusive legal authority for domestic security activities."

Why then should the intelligence committee or the Senate in enacting a statute purporting to provide such legal authority for foreign intelligence wiretapping leave open even the possibility of some inherent Presidential power to conduct such tapping in violation of that statute?

Although the intelligence committee limited the definition of an "agent of a foreign power" eligible to be tapped, S. 3197 still includes among such agents any citizen who at the direction of a foreign power secretly transfers information which a reasonable person might believe harmful to the security of the United States.

But what a "reasonable person," whoever he or she might be, may believe does not necessarily define criminal activity. This section, as the American Civil Liberties Union charges in a memorandum of opposition to S. 3197, may well amount to "a new, all-inclusive and overbroad definition of espionage," which the Administration has not been able to persuade Congress to provide in other legislation.

Many other questions are raised by S. 3197; it does not require, for example, that for a warrant to be issued, probable cause must be shown that specific evidence is being sought, and that it is likely to be obtained by the proposed tap.

Honest men might differ, of course, about many of the objections raised by the A.C.L.U., Senator Mondale and Senator John Tunney, the bill's principal opponent. But that is all the more reason to proceed slowly on a matter of this importance. Together with the possibility of a new Administration that may have new proposals, the questions about S. 3197 argue strongly for delaying action until next year.

TROTSKYISM AND TERRORISM: PART III—LATIN AMERICAN TERRORISM

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

ARGENTINA

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the first section of the Fourth International to adopt terrorism as a tactic was the group in Argentina called Palabra Obrera, led by Nahuel Moreno. Moreno arranged for Argentine Trotskyite cadres to be trained in Cuba in all aspects of revolutionary armed struggle, including terrorism, as early as 1962.¹ This was consistent with the policy of "entrism" developed by Pablo and Mandel. Trotskyites discovered among the membership of Communist organizations had been expelled, or in some cases were murdered by the Stalinist Communists. For example, 500 Trotskyite Vietnamese cadres were killed by the Stalinists under

Ho Chi Minh.² Only the Cuban Communists accepted the Trotskyites as allies.

In 1961, terrorist acts were carried out by the Trotskyites in Tucuman. Activities included an "expropriation" the euphemism for a bank robbery.³ In 1963, Palabra Obrera merged with the Castroite group, Frente Revolucionario Indoamericano Popular, FRIP. This group pressed for an escalation of "armed struggle." In 1965, the organization was renamed Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores, PRT. The PRT leaders were Moreno and Mario Roberto Santucho.

Under the Santucho leadership, a PRT cadre in Tucuman led violent street mobs throwing Molotov cocktails and firing pistols at police officers and stations.⁴

In 1968 the PRT split over a combination of personality and tactical disputes. Santucho's group, the PRT-Combatiente, openly espoused and engaged in terrorist activities. The PRT-Verdad, headed by Moreno, played down the armed struggle aspects of revolutionary activity, and emphasized electoral action.

The Ninth World Congress of the Fourth International held in 1969 recognized the Santucho group as the official Argentine section of the Fourth International and the Moreno group as a sympathizing section. Since that time the Moreno group merged with the Coral faction of the Argentine Socialist Party to form the Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores, PST—the Argentine Socialist Workers Party.

The Tenth World Congress of the Fourth International held in 1974 voted to continue the PST as a sympathizing section although they were allowed to participate and vote at the Congress. A secret resolution was passed with the admonition that it not be published in the public press of the International. The resolution passed by the proterrorist IMT majority in the World Congress excoriates the PST for dodging "the problems of armed struggle, of the violent destruction of the bourgeois state, of the formation of workers' militias" and for using "ambiguous formulas in its press that give the impression that the proletariat could win simply through propaganda against the army, directed to soldiers and noncommissioned officers, without necessarily forming armed detachments of the proletariat and without armed confrontations with the bourgeois repressive apparatus." (The full text of the resolution appears in the appendix following this section.)

The Santucho faction held a secret congress on July 19-20, 1970, at which the decision was made to organize their armed units into the Ejercito Revolucionario Popular, ERP, which was to be tightly controlled by the political leadership of the PRT. The PRT resolution stated in part:

The Central Committee and executive committee of the party will make up the collective leadership conducting the war. It will appoint the national military secretary, the military leaders of the various units, the respective political commissioners and the military committee of the party. In the countryside, these military leaders will make up the branch and section executive committees of the party. On all levels the cells of

Footnotes at end of article.

the party that are in the army will assure that the military directives coming from the Central Committee and the executive committee are steadfastly and correctly applied.

Groups and individuals from outside the party who join the ERP will do so under the condition that they accept the party's military leadership and the political commissions it designates.⁵

From 1971 through mid-1975 the ERP was the most successful revolutionary terrorist group in the Western Hemisphere, raising many millions of dollars in ransom from kidnap victims. The ERP made a specialty of assassinating aged retired military officers, ambushing police and small military units, and robbing banks for additional funds. Executives and employees of multinational corporations were made special targets for ERP kidnappings and assassinations.

Santucho himself was captured by the Argentine police, but in August 1972, led a spectacular jailbreak from Trelew prison. Santucho and some guerrillas hijacked an airplane and fled over the Andes to Chile where they received a warm welcome from Chile's Marxist-Leninist President Allende who aided them in traveling to Cuba where they were given a very warm welcome and refuge.⁶

In 1973, Santucho led his PRT/ERP out of the Fourth International. A very small faction remained in the FI and continued terrorist activity. This group, which called itself the ERP-Red Faction, kidnaped in May 1973 a business executive, Aaron Bellinson, and received \$1 million for his release. Bellinson was released on June 3, 1973. The ERP-Red Faction turned \$100,000 of this sum over to Livio Maitan, an official of the Fourth International. Half of the money was to go toward Fourth International operations, and half was to be transferred to the MIR terrorists in Chile.⁷

Less than 2 months after receiving the extortion money, Maitan appeared at the national convention of the Socialist Workers Party, held in Ohio, August 5-10, 1973. Maitan, attending the convention as a leading FI-IEC official, spoke in support of terrorism as an immediate tactic at the convention.⁸

A series of Argentine police raids during 1975 broke the back of the Red Faction which had changed its name to the Revolutionary Communist League, LCR.⁹

The Santucho majority of the ERP became the cornerstone of a Latin American "terrorist international" called the Revolutionary Coordinating Committee, JCR. This apparatus was created late in 1973 to coordinate the activities of the Castroite Tupamaros of Uruguay, the MIR of Chile—which also had a Castroite orientation but a Trotskyite origin—and the ELN of Bolivia, a Trotskyite successor to Che Guevara's group of the same name.

In June 1974, \$5 million that had been extorted by the ERP from the Exxon Corp. as a result of the kidnaping of Victor Samuels, Exxon operations manager in Argentina, was divided among the three other JCR terrorist groups.¹⁰

Each of the JCR groups supplied cadre to the others to engage in terrorist activities throughout Latin America. The

JCR has also established three European offices in Rome, Lisbon, and Paris to maintain contact with other terrorist organizations.

Effective action by the governments of Uruguay, Chile, Argentina, and Bolivia has wiped out a substantial portion of the JCR leadership. On July 19, 1976, Mario Roberto Santucho was killed in a shootout with Argentinian counter-insurgency forces in the town of Mercedes in Buenos Aires province.

The PST, led by Moreno, serves as a major force in the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction of the Fourth International. However, a dispute has developed between the Moreno organization and the U.S. Socialist Workers Party which controls the faction. This has resulted in the possibility that Moreno may pull his group out of the Fourth International, thus greatly reducing the strength of the Socialist Workers Party's LTP.¹¹

BOLIVIA

The Bolivian section of the Fourth International, the Partido Obrero Revolucionario, POR, is headed by Hugo Gonzales Moscoso. He is a leader of the pro-terrorism now IMT faction of the Fourth International. In 1967, the POR established an underground terrorist armed branch, the ELN, which was named for the group led by Che Guevara in Bolivia which had been wiped out that year.¹²

Hugo Gonzales Moscoso wrote in the September 22, 1969, issue of *Intercontinental Press*, that the POR and ELN had suffered severe losses in combat with the police, but that on July 14 they had resumed activity by murdering a man who had allegedly assisted the police in tracking down Guevara's group.

Martine Knoeller, a leader of the IMT faction in the Fourth International, boasted in 1973 that "the Bolivian comrades adopted their turn toward armed struggle long before the Ninth World Congress," of the Fourth International.¹³ Although decimated by police and military actions, the Bolivian Trotskyites continue to attempt to organize among the tin miners, particularly in the Siglo district.

An appendix and the footnotes to this text follow:

APPENDIX

Resolution passed at 10th World Congress of the Fourth International, February, 1974, and expurgated from the text of the resolutions published in *Intercontinental Press*, December 23, 1974. The secret resolution was published in the *International Internal Discussion Bulletin*, Vol. XII, No. 1, January, 1975, p. 10.

[Point 36 of the majority resolution "Argentina: Political Crisis and Revolutionary Perspectives" is published internally only, in accordance with a motion adopted by a majority of the United Secretariat in May 1974.]

36. The World Congress draws a balance sheet on the organization recognized at the Ninth World Congress as a sympathizing organization. It can only be an extremely critical one.

First of all, the *La Verdad* group has publicly attacked several sections in Latin America in its press, and especially some leaders of the International who were guilty of defending the orientations decided on by the last World Congress.

Secondly, *La Verdad* has made clear its fundamental misunderstanding of the neces-

sities of armed struggle at the present stage of the class struggle in Argentina, engaging in a political line that is in the first place purely syndicalist, and secondly, electoralist—for example, its election campaign in which it maintained complete silence on the necessity to destroy the bourgeois state apparatus.

Prepared to pay any price within its legalist perspective it reached an agreement, on the basis of a centrist political line, for political and organizational fusion with the Coral faction of the PSA (Argentine Socialist Party), a small left Social-Democratic current with no influence in the working class. The new party, the PST (Socialist Workers Party), confronted Peronism with a combination of purely propagandist positions and clearly opportunist attitudes. For example, it appealed to Peron to "put himself at the head of struggles"; it demanded that slates of FREJULI, the bourgeois Peronist party, be made up of "80 percent workers candidates"; it demanded that Campora, the bourgeois, form a government "with a majority working-class composition"; it carried on a respectful and responsible (sic) dialogue between Coral and the bourgeois finance Minister Gelbard, etc., etc.

The daily practice of the PST reflects a tail-endist and legalistic concept of building the party. It dodges the problems of armed struggle, of the violent destruction of the bourgeois state, of the formation of workers militias, not only in terms of present tasks but even in its programmatic formulations, as, for example, in the *La Verdad*-PSA fusion protocol. In its press it conducts no systematic propaganda for arming the workers, not even for workers self-defense. It uses ambiguous formulas in its press that give the impression that the proletariat could win simply through propaganda against the army, directed to soldiers and noncommissioned officers, without necessarily forming armed detachments of the proletariat and without armed confrontations with the bourgeois repressive apparatus.

The PST has several thousand members and organized sympathizers. Most are students and workers who sincerely want to struggle for socialism and who sympathize with Trotskyism. Consequently, the World Congress favors maintaining fraternal links between the Fourth International and the PST as a sympathizing group. But the International cannot grant recognition as an "official" section to an organization with a political line and practice that are so far removed from the principles and tradition of our movement.

FOOTNOTES

¹ International Internal Discussion Bulletin, Volume XI, No. 5, April, 1974, p. 18, "Letter to the World Congress from Luis" describing the early history of Trotskyist "armed struggle" in Argentina and Peru.

² Ibid., p. 16, "Letter to the World Congress from the Bolshevik-Leninist of Vietnam." The Fourth International (N.Y.), published by the SWP, November-December, 1951, reported the arrest of the leaders of the Vietnam Trotskyites by the Viet Minh authorities. Despite this, they said, "In Vietnam our reorganized forces will also attempt to work in the organizations influenced by the Stalinists, naturally including its armed formations. They will grant critical support to the Ho Chi-minh regime in its struggle against imperialism, while distinguishing themselves from it on the goal of this struggle and the best means to lead it to victory."

³ Ibid., p. 18.

⁴ International Internal Discussion Bulletin, Volume X, No. 5, April, 1973. Resolutions of the Fifth Congress of the P.R.T., p. 4-7.

⁵ Ibid., p. 20.

⁶ Intercontinental Press, September 11, 1972.

⁷ Trotskyite Terrorist International, hearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, July 24, 1975, p. 112-113.

⁸ Internal Information Bulletin, December, 1973, No. 7 for 1973, p. 3-5, and Internal Information Bulletin, August, 1974, No. 7 for 1974, p. 3-4.

⁹ Trotskyite Terrorist International, op. cit., p. 112.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 114.

¹¹ Mary Alice Waters, memo to the steering committee on the Leninist-Trotskyist Faction, November 28, 1975.

¹² World Outlook (Now Intercontinental Press), July 14, 1976.

¹³ International Internal Discussion Bulletin, Volume X, No. 24, December, 1973.

A STEP IN RESTORING THE ECONOMIC HEALTH OF THE NORTHEAST-MIDWEST CORRIDORS

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, on September 2, the initial meeting of the Northeast-Midwest Economic Advancement Coalition—NMEAC—will take place. I wish to commend my colleagues Mr. REUSS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ASHLEY, and Mr. HORTON for the leadership they have demonstrated by forming this long-needed coalition. The primary functions of this coalition will be to examine the economic decay of the Northeast and Midwest corridors and to examine ways in which this decay can be arrested and economic health restored.

I have written a preface to a book to be published within the next few months by Prof. Alan Barton of Columbia University. The preface details the discrimination by the Federal Government toward the declining cities of the Northeast-Midwest corridors. It pinpoints the kinds of discrimination involved in Federal policies and programs—housing, transportation, and Federal employment—both military and civilian, toward cities in general, and documents the urgency of our search for solutions to the fiscal crisis that is now beginning to afflict virtually all of our major cities, North and South, East and West. The text of the preface follows:

PREFACE FOR THE BARTON BOOK

"... Now just a word about campaign strategy. I will have no Southern strategy; but I will have an Eastern one—saw it off and let it float away..."—Senator BARRY GOLDWATER.

Knowingly or unknowingly, the federal government has joined hands with the state governments, and through implementation of a complex web of programs and policies which systematically discriminate against the Northeast and North-central regions of the United States, they have in effect adopted Senator Goldwater's eastern campaign strategy.

However, there is every indication that large cities in general—not simply the declining cities of the Northeast—will be coping with increasingly greater fiscal problems. For the most part, the afflicted cities are those

which are located in the ailing states of the Northeast and Central industrial corridors. However, there are several notable exceptions including Atlanta, Birmingham, New Orleans, and San Francisco, all of which have very serious financial problems.

The existence of a national pattern of urban decline makes it clear that there are fundamental and widespread urban problems which contribute greatly to the cause of individual city crises. Different cities will continue to experience varying degrees of excessive debt, above average unemployment, and unacceptably high costs of living.

Indeed, recent evidence suggests that suburban regions of the United States are beginning to experience many of the same financial ills as urban areas. The U.S. Conference of Mayors solicited financial information from 469 cities across the nation. In June of 1976 the Conference reported that the country's suburban and sun-belt communities—places such as Beverly Hills and Phoenix, which experienced substantial economic and population growth in the early 1970's—are beginning to show the first symptoms of financial crisis.

It is critically important to divorce self-inflicted urban problems from those problems that occur due to forces beyond the control of local governments. New York City is an almost perfect case study in the financial problems of local governments caused predominantly by national and state programs and policies utterly beyond the City's control. Although New York City has no doubt in many ways contributed to her own near demise, nevertheless, the federal government, the state government, and certain institutional factors seem to be the major culprits.

In fact, New York City has managed to turn its economy around somewhat in the past eight months. However, monumental problems still afflict the local, regional, and state economies, all of which continue to perform less well than the national economy.

The New York Times of July 22, 1976 reported that the nations, unemployment rate fell 2.1 percentage points, from 8.8 to 6.7 percent from January to May. The unemployment rate for New York, however, fell only 1.2 percentage points, from 10.4 to 9.2 percent in the same time period.

Most interesting was a set of Labor Department figures which illustrate that while the City and State continued to lose jobs from January to May, the decline was almost entirely attributable to government jobs and in construction jobs dependent on government expenditures.

The one year loss of jobs in New York State was 107,300 with 91,500 of them in government and 12,800 in construction. The private sector, with a loss of only 3,000 jobs, therefore, has essentially stabilized its employment levels.

This employment example points out the futility of City efforts to improve its financial position without federal cooperation. Because of the Federal government's size, the impact of its programs and policies far outweigh the economic policies of an individual local government, even New York City—with a \$12 billion budget—equal to the 18 smallest state budgets taken together.

I am convinced that significant changes in the federal and state programs and policies which now cripple the City will not occur without:

—well documented justifications for changes in these policies and programs. It is in this area that increased social science research must play an invaluable role. It should be the primary goal of our researchers to produce credible and workmanlike documentation of the discrimination against our cities. We know that it exists, but its exasperatingly difficult to document!

—the proper climate in the United States. Every citizen of the U.S. must perceive New York City and other major urban centers as integral components of our nations. Congressmen simply will not vote to help cities if it means taking dangerous flak from their constituents.

Perhaps the upbeat themes symbolized by Operation Sail and by the Democratic National Convention have helped to dispel the ugly myth that New York is too far gone—and too evil—to bother saving.

Let's look now at New York City's fiscal problems.

CITY EXCESSES

City Services: New York City provides a vast array of expensive services that other cities simply do not provide, or provide on a very modest scale. The 1975-76 municipal budget included (apart from pension costs): \$447 million for higher education; \$890 million for municipal hospitals; \$586 million for charitable institutions (most of which consists of payments to private hospitals); \$90 million for the health department; \$71 million for addiction services; \$137 million for various housing activities; and \$180 million in subsidies for mass transportation. Although State and Federal Government grants take up the lions share of these costs, the City's taxpayers must contribute more than a billion dollars annually to fund these programs.

The two most flagrant excesses are in public welfare expenditures and in health and hospital expenditures. New York City spends \$199 per capita for public welfare programs as opposed to the national average of only \$32 per capita. And, the City spends \$82 per capita on health and hospitals versus the national average of only \$29.

Fringe Benefits: No study of New York can ignore the question of public employee fringe and retirement benefits. In this fiscal year, employee fringe benefits such as pensions, health insurance, uniform allowances and the like, will cost New York City taxpayers more than \$2 billion. Now hear this: Based on a full time municipal working force of 232,000, this cost averages out to more than \$8,600 per employee! In other words, New York City's taxpayers spend more per employee on fringe benefits alone (\$8,600) than the average American's total annual income (\$6,059)!

Some of New York's unique fringe benefits include:

\$36 million annually into Union Annuity Funds which provide still more retirement benefits in the form of annuities to certain groups of employees.

\$107 million in direct payments to municipal unions for such fringe benefits as free dental care, eyeglasses, psychiatric counseling, and legal services.

\$19 million for uniform allowances that go not only to policemen and firemen, but also to marine engineers, aqueduct captains, speech and hearing therapists, public health nurses, nurses aides, ambulance technicians, deckhands, and swimming pool operators.

\$1,165 million in pensions which are distributed under the most generous formula in the United States. For example, a New York City employee who retires at age 65 with 25 years of service, receives annually in net after tax retirement income an amount equal to 125% of his after tax income in his last year on the job. The equivalent percentage in Atlanta is 43%, in Chicago 47%, in Dallas 52%, and in Los Angeles 54%. Only Denver and Detroit at 91% and 104% even approach New York's generosity.

City Action: Yet the City has taken responsible actions to rectify these problems. New York has attempted to stem its flow of fiscal hemorrhaging through widespread wage and hiring freezes, layoffs, cutting back on uniform allowances, and other politically difficult but necessary measures. For example,

from December 1974 to February 1976, New York City has terminated employment through layoffs and attrition of more than 43,000 of its nearly 370,000 employees for a savings and more than \$600 million."

In addition, in March of 1976, the City proposed draconian budget cuts and requested state and federal action that taken together, would lop \$379 million off the City budget in fiscal year 1977 and \$862 million off the budget in 1978. Included in the City's proposed cuts are phasing down city support for CUNY City Colleges (\$113 million); reduction in welfare costs not mandated by statute (\$60 million); and reduction in certain employee benefits (\$24 million).

\$250 million of the cuts are part of the FY 1976-77 budget reduction program. This program includes cutting education costs by \$47 million; police costs by \$40 million; fire department costs by \$8.5 million; sanitation costs by \$8.7 million; Health and Hospitals Corporation costs by \$27 million; and social services costs by \$12 million.

Unfortunately, as the Congressional Budget Office of the U.S. Congress reported in October, 1975: "At this advanced stage of the fiscal crisis, few, if any, options remain open to the city acting alone." These budget cuts are the only methods available to bring the city's outflow of resources under control.

However, there is also the need to revitalize the inflow of resources. A primary element of this program must be the reconstituting of our tax structure once again to make the City viable and competitive. And that means tax reduction.

Unfortunately, New York has been forced to do just the opposite—they have increased their taxes. They have implemented new taxes designed to yield \$500 million from December 1, 1975 through June 30, 1978 including higher taxes on personal income, estates, and cigarettes, an increase in the minimum corporate income tax, and an extension of the sales tax to cover personal services. The City has also increased real estate taxes in an attempt to raise \$400 million.

New York's municipal tax system already encourages the continued erosion of the City's tax base by perpetuating the high cost of living, working, and producing in the City. Already there are more types of municipal taxes—22—and higher per capita municipal taxes—\$648 per man, woman, and child—weighing on New Yorkers than in any other municipality in the nation.

When the steady increasing cost of doing business in New York City appear to justify the expense and dislocation of moving out of the City, the businessmen move. Questions of civic obligation and fairness do not enter their calculations of costs and benefits. Until the day comes when businessmen conform to a different standard of motivation than that of profit and loss, we had best avoid political rhetoric and concentrate on creating the financial environment that will keep them at home. This does not include raising taxes.

Essentially, New York City has done all it can. Yet the crisis still exists for New York City and for other local governments. And thus we will have to look at other factors as primary causes of local fiscal crisis.

THE ARCH VILLAIN: FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND POLICIES

Federal spending: The discriminatory effects of current federal spending are staggering. It is clear that we urgently need to reevaluate some of our national programs and policies with respect to their impact on cities and then to recast them without their discriminating elements. For current federal actions not only have contributed to urban decline, but also have accelerated the process. For example:

There is a tremendous disparity in the current allocation of the federal pay check. In 1973, according to the Department of Commerce, military and civilian pay checks ac-

counted for 10 percent of the total payroll dollars of our fourteen fastest growing states: Arizona, Florida, Colorado, Alaska, Idaho, Mississippi, Utah, Arkansas, Virginia, Hawaii, South Carolina, North Carolina, Tennessee, and New Mexico. During that same time period, in the five states which are declining the fastest—New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Ohio, and Illinois—the federal military and civilian payroll accounted for only 2.5% of the total payroll dollars of those states. The federal payroll stimulus is going where it is needed least.

Compounding this disparity is an equally unfair and discriminatory allocation of military construction dollars. Fiscal Year 1976 Department of Defense military construction authorizations included \$102 million for the northeast and midwest industrial corridors with a population of 85.5 million people. The same bill included \$800 million for the southern states with a population of only 54.1 million—a pattern of discrimination of 12.6 to 1.

Aside from the immediate employment payoffs of such a biased construction allocation, we know that for every dollar spent on military construction in a state, the multiplier effect results in an increase of the payroll of that state by \$2.50. Thus, from a basepoint of the current 3 per cent/12 per cent disparity in Federal military and civilian payroll, we compound the differential first, by the immediate employment effects of the military construction; second, by the multiplier effects of the construction; and third, by the further disparity in federal payroll—through the military and civilian personnel who will be employed in the new military facilities so unfairly distributed—'til the memory of man runneth not.

Particularly revealing is a comparison of the 1973 Federal civilian employees per 1000 population ratios of several states:

New York	0.92
Massachusetts	1.09
Kentucky	1.24
South Carolina	1.31
Montana	1.53
Nevada	1.71
Wyoming	1.74
Georgia	1.78
Louisiana	2.26
New Mexico	2.54
Utah	3.46
Hawaii	3.96
Alaska	5.73

Note that it is New York and Massachusetts with the fewest civilian employees per 1000 in population.

The Congressional Research Service released the following data on May 20, 1976:

PERCENT INCREASE IN FEDERAL CIVILIAN AND MILITARY WAGE AND SALARY DISBURSEMENTS BY REGION AND SUBREGION, 1964-74

(Dollar amounts in millions)			
Region	1964	1974	Percent change
United States	\$27,765	\$58,134	103.4
Northeast	4,767	8,519	78.7
New England	1,373	2,227	62.2
Middle Atlantic	3,395	6,292	85.3
South	11,909	26,173	119.8
South Atlantic	7,372	16,508	123.9
East south-central	1,710	3,631	113.3
West south-central	2,828	6,033	113.3
North-central	4,554	9,204	102.1
East north-central	1,707	3,480	103.8
West north-central	2,855	5,724	99.8
West	6,535	14,238	117.8
Mountain	1,635	3,774	130.8
Pacific	4,900	10,465	113.6

This chart deals with the total percentage increase in civilian and military payroll from 1964 to 1974 broken down by region and sub-region. Note the following items:

The Northeast and Northcentral regions of the United States, with more than 85.5 million population, had less than \$18 billion in payroll disbursements in 1974. However, the South, with a population of only 54.1 million, had more than \$26 billion in disbursements.

From 1964 to 1974 the Federal payroll more than doubled—109.4 percent increase.

During the same time period, the payroll in the Northcentral region just barely doubled—102.1 percent increase—while the payroll in the Northeast only increased by 78.7 percent. However, the South and West regions experienced growth percentages far above the national average—119.8 percent for the South and 117.8 percent for the West.

Finally a more general symptom of decline can be documented by examining the fluctuation in the private sector work force. From 1970 to 1973 loss of jobs was acute in both Boston (16,000) and New York (244,000). At the same time the work force increased in such cities as Atlanta (41,000) and New Orleans (16,000).

Welfare: The national welfare program is a disaster for New York City and indeed for many of the welfare recipients themselves. The City's welfare rolls have tripled in the past twenty years. One in eight of New York's residents is on welfare, a burden the City can no longer afford to shoulder unassisted.

We have to eliminate incentives in our welfare programs which attract welfare families to the high cost of living metropolitan areas of the Northeast. We need a national welfare standard that over a period of time will result in welfare families migrating to where their fixed incomes will buy them the most goods and services—regions where a simpler life style will allow their welfare dollars to give them a better life.

Moreover, right now, by attracting these people to our teeming metropolis, we are almost dooming both parents and kids to perpetual failure, because, in all too many cases, neither parents nor kids can cope with the demands for sophisticated urban skills which cities like New York require.

Finally, it is important to realize that the real costs of welfare are far above the states expenditures. When one adds to New York City's \$2.5 billion welfare bill the escalating extra costs of public housing, remedial education, law enforcement, and health care, which a large welfare population requires, the total cost of government per welfare family boggles the mind. For just one example, the City of New York spends \$2500 per year on just the health care of each welfare family.

Housing: New York City's vast Federally assisted public housing complexes have also proven to be a great burden on the City, demeaning and dangerously threatening to the poor, especially the elderly poor, destabilizing to neighborhoods surrounding the projects, and further eroding the already threatened urban tax base. Federal public housing was meant to stabilize and improve neighborhoods—to be a plus, not a threat to the very existence of the neighborhood.

We should declare a halt on the construction of additional high-rise public housing projects until we can resolve the problems which result from the concentration of a seemingly permanent low income, marginally skilled population in New York City demonstrably unable to cope.

It is vitally important to the City of New York to receive federal assistance in providing middle class housing at shelter costs which make it feasible and attractive for middle class families to continue living in the City.

Only with these two steps can we fulfill the original legislative intent of the Housing Act—to stabilize neighborhoods by provid-

ing housing for the working poor and by providing a new flow of truly middle class housing.

As Lawrence M. Friedman pointed out in his book, *The Government and Slum Housing* (1968): "Under the Housing Act program, tenants were not to be given charity; they were going to 'pay their own way.' They could well imagine that they were paying the 'true' rent for their units, that is, the current operating expenses. The requirement of a rental sufficient to meet expenses would, furthermore, tend to restrict public housing to the honest, working poor. Dependent families, families with no income, and problem families would be usually too poor for public housing... Public housing was originally aimed at the submerged and potential middle class which was lower class in income, but middle class in values or aspirations..." Would that it had been thus!

Transportation: Federal transportation expenditures provide another time tested pattern of systematic discrimination against New York City and other urban areas.

In the past four decades the two thirds of our nation's citizens who live in cities have, through their \$80 billion in tax contributions, literally built the federal highway systems which coupled with the FHA home mortgage insurance program and 100% federal grants for sewer and water projects make suburbia viable. It's high time that the cities began to receive a little help for their transportation problems.

Both revenues and ridership on New York City public transportation have continued to decline. Fare increases have traditionally stimulated decreases in ridership. By the year 1980 it is estimated that the combined operating deficit for the public transportation systems in New York State will reach \$1.4 billion.

The national average for federal mass transit subsidy is 5.09 cents per ride. Yet New York receives only 1.07 cents per ride while Denver, Houston, Los Angeles, Louisville, Albuquerque, Tulsa, Dayton, Fort Worth, Tampa, Wichita, Akron, and Grand Rapids all receive more than 11 cents per ride, with Grand Rapids unaccountably receiving more than 45 cents per ride. If the federal government subsidized New York City at the national average of 5.09 cents per ride the operating assistance to New York would go up two and a half times.

Because these funds are distributed on the basis of percentage of total population rather than percentage of mass transit ridership, the New York metropolitan area, with 10 percent of the nation's population, receives just about 10 percent of the mass transportation assistance, instead of the 40 percent to which it is entitled by serving 40 percent of the nation's mass transit riders. Thus, the funds that have been allocated over the six year life of the program include only \$41,000 per vehicle in New York, yet more than \$400,000 per vehicle in San Bernardino, California.

These figures cannot be justified by any reasonable person. New York is given by far the least amount per rider and per vehicle when, in fact, if the federal distribution formula had been based on ridership, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority would have received in excess of \$150 million in operating assistance rather than the \$62 million they received.

Tax/expenditure policies: As a symptom of all of the above problems an examination of total Federal tax and expenditure policies is revealing. A survey published by the *National Journal* in June 1976 showed that the five Great Lakes states and the Middle Atlantic states of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania contributed \$28.6 billion more in taxes than they received in federal outlays. The study also disclosed that, at the

same time, the federal government poured \$22.1 billion more into the Southwest and West than it collected in federal revenues.

Discrimination against the Northeast and Midwest in the various forms of federal pay-rolls, federal construction, welfare housing, and transportation policies all add up to a significant burden that no single local government can cope with—even through the implementation of harsh and draconian budget cuts. It is clear that solutions to our localities' financial problems hinge critically on making changes in federal programs and policies.

HURTFUL STATE REQUIREMENTS

New York State operates on a unique fiscal structure which emphasizes the role of the local government. The State continues to be characterized by a relatively large local sector. In New York State local governments raise 52 percent of state and local revenues from their own sources, compared to 47 percent for the nation as a whole. In New York State local governments account for 78 percent of direct state and local expenditures, compared to 63 percent for the nation as a whole. New York City, as the home of 43 percent of the state's residents thus starts off with a relatively larger burden than the average city.

However, numerous state policies have harmful effects which serve to aggravate this already unfair situation. New York State is well known for the generous size of its budget for government services; total per capita state and local expenditures are nearly 65 percent above the national average. New York is particularly generous in the social welfare area. Per capita expenditures for welfare and health are more than two and half times larger than the national average. Yet it is precisely in these areas where all local governments play an unusually large role. In other words, New York City pays the lion's share of the burden for New York State's generous social welfare standards.

Welfare policies: The best example of this discrimination is in the area of welfare. Under the federal law the states set the benefit levels for their residents. Yet New York City (as 5 counties) pays 25% of the total cost of the program (half the non-federal share.) Thus, for every \$100 increase in benefits mandated by the State, New York City must pay \$25. While Los Angeles in 1973 spent less than .1% of its total budget on welfare and Chicago contributed only 1.1%, New York City was saddled with a bill of almost \$2.5 billion or 21.6% of its total budget—200 times the proportion Los Angeles is forced to pay and 20 times the proportion Chicago is forced to pay!

If the state is going to continue to mandate costly and incomparably generous cost of living increases in welfare payments, Medicaid rates, and other social services, it should also be prepared to foot a larger percentage of the bill.

Court, probation, and correction services: A second area in which the state costs the City substantial sums of money is that of court, probation, and correction services. Currently these services cost the City of New York more than \$270 million, the State more than \$300 million, and other counties more than \$160 million. The cost to the state of assuming just the City's costs would be \$273 million—only \$3 million more than the City has to pay.

The arguments in favor of state assumption of court costs include administrative, financial, and equity arguments. Currently, due to the decentralized nature of the courts, there is massive inefficiency. Centralization of court costs would solve this problem. The Temporary Commission on City Finances reported that court operations could be more productive and less expensive if the state both financed and administered the program. And, because of the diverse funding levels

throughout the state, an argument can be made that sentencing inequities result from the current administration of justice.

Similar arguments can be made for state assumption of probation and correction costs. The U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the Temporary Commission in City Finances, and the American Bar Association Commission on Standards of Judicial Administration all argue that the state should assume court, probation and correction costs on the equity and efficiency arguments alone. Add to these arguments the City's fiscal crisis and such state action seems imperative and long overdue, the more so, inasmuch as the State acquiesced to the budget gimmicks that over the years put the City where it is today.

State action is needed: What is clear is that the City has shown good faith through draconian budget cuts. Yet the fiscal crisis continues unabated. Within this context, State and Federal action would seem mandatory.

The state sets benefit levels and reimbursement rates for social welfare programs including welfare and Medicaid, and the state maintains little or no financial responsibility in many areas within their province including courts, probation, and correction facilities.

The state must be prepared at a minimum either to assume some of these burdens, or more importantly, to alter some of its key policies and programs by which it imposes a level of services and costs on New York which no other City is required to meet.

DEMOGRAPHIC AND INSTITUTIONAL CAUSES OF THE CRISIS

We've examined actions the City has taken on its own that have led to its current fiscal crisis. We've also scrutinized hurtful state and federal policies and programs which discriminate against the City. A final category of problems are institutional factors harmful contributions that are not clearly caused by the city, the state, or the federal government.

Psychological factors: The immediate fiscal crisis stemmed from a loss of investor confidence in the credit-worthiness of the city. Although some of the loss of investor confidence must be due to the City's questionable accounting practices over the years the sudden shift in investor attitudes was due largely to psychological factors, for surely the City's long run economic prospects, which determine its ability to pay off its long term debt, cannot be much different today than it was a year or two ago.

Inflation: The severe inflation has had an effect on the fiscal position of New York. Although the long run inflation may increase the value of the tax base sufficiently to compensate for decreased purchasing power, in the short run expenditures tend to be far more responsive to inflationary pressures.

Migration: For the past decade or two cities in general and New York in particular have been called upon to assimilate a new wave of immigrants from the South and the Caribbean. This rural migration to the Northeast industrial centers took place just as a major shift of employment opportunities was occurring from the industrial core cities to the suburbs. As a result of the immigration of primarily unskilled labor from the South, the out-migration of jobs and middle class residents to the suburbs, and the natural aging of the population, those more heavily dependent on City services—the poor, the uneducated, the non-English speaking—comprise an ever increasing segment of the City's population.

Inadequate tax base: Finally, the City's tax base has failed to grow as rapidly as its level of expenditures for public services. This situation has been attributed to shifts in the location of economic activity as well as to the continued suburbanization of middle

and upper class residents. Coupled with the increasing level of City services, the slow rate of growth of the tax base which has lagged far behind the inflation of both the per unit cost and the volume of city services and facilities—has been crippling.

Indeed, the Congressional Budget office concluded that: "The City can exert little influence over either the population shifts or the tax base trends. Together, they have produced a steady increase in city tax levels which has, in turn, probably affected the types of persons and businesses willing to remain in or move into the City."

Undeniably, there have been excesses in City spending. But the City is struggling valiantly to bring the excesses under control. And other Cities have been following suit. Yet, financial crisis continues to plague city after city, and, if the Mayor's Conference Reports is to be believed, the creeping financial crisis is beginning to reach suburbia and the sun belt states as well.

The widespread nature of this phenomenon in spite of local governmental action requires us perforce to look elsewhere for the root causes of urban financial instability. And we are led irresistibly—by the logic of events and causes—to the conclusion that it is the state and federal governments that are the prime contributors to the problem, aided and abetted by certain institutional factors which are not under anyone's direct control.

Happily, both the State and the Federal governments clearly do have the power to correct their policies and programs. And, most significantly, the federal government has the power both to right its current discriminatory policies and also to institute compensatory programs not only righting the wrongs they have committed but also offsetting some of the institutional problems not caused by any level of government, but simply produced by the myriad private decisions of the classical market place.

As yet, the federal government has shown a reluctance to move in this direction. And Congressmen, Senators, and City Fathers have little in the way of factual research providing hard core justifications for implementation of such compensatory programmatic changes.

Current statistics do little to prove the case of federal discrimination. The use of the Standard Metropolitan Statistical area (SMSA) as an accounting region does not show the clear discrimination, since SMSA's include suburban areas as well as urban areas, making it unclear as to how well the city alone fares in comparison to the entire region. Similarly, the use of Counties as an accounting region does not reflect the inequities to which urban areas are subjected. In short, there is no comprehensive set of truly urban statistics which deal with the boundaries of a city as an independent political unit.

A second, related function of social science research must be to develop technologies so that we can apply all of our technological and behavioral science know-how to making social service delivery programs work. Right now our social service delivery systems such as education, health, welfare, and law enforcement, are ineffectual, wasteful, and oft-times destructive of the goals they are wrought to achieve. Applied "soft" research in the social sciences would help stretch the beleaguered city dollar further by improving the effectiveness and cost/benefit ratios of governmental social service expenditures.

There are solutions to our fiscal crisis short of sawing off the Eastern seaboard and letting it float away. Strong coordinated action by the federal, state, and local governments is necessary.

Just as saving the farmers and building suburbia were the major goals of the United States in the 1930's and 1940's, rebuilding our cities and restructuring their beleaguered

economies must be a major national goal of the 1970's and 1980's.

THE BALANCE(S) OF POWER: IV (iv)

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my discussion of the strategic defensive balance in my series on "The Balance(s) of Power," I inserted an article in the August 23, 1976, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Sidney D. Drell who argued that the price of civil defense is too high in relation to the degree of protection it buys.

Today I wish to insert an opposite viewpoint regarding civil defense as expressed in an article, "Civil Defense in Limited War—A Debate: Have Recent Developments in Strategic Weapons Given Us Reason To Look at Civil Defense in a New Context?" in *Physics Today*, part II—main edition, May 13, 1976. The argument made by Arthur A. Broyles and Eugene Wigner suggests that civil defense can be effective as a defense against nuclear attack.

Arthur A. Broyles is professor of physics and physical science at the University of Florida, Gainesville, and Eugene Wigner is professor emeritus in the department of physics at Princeton University.

The article follows at this point:

CIVIL DEFENSE IN LIMITED WAR

Should the American people be protected from the effects of nuclear War? Let us first narrow that intensely studied question¹ to one that lies within the realm of physics to answer—namely, can such protection be effective? Evaluations of various evacuation and shelter systems show that they can greatly reduce the number of casualties in a nuclear encounter. Our response thus agrees entirely with the statement by V. Chuykov in the *Civil Defense Handbook of the USSR*: "Although the discussed means of destruction are called mass means, with knowledge and skillful use of modern protective measures, they will not destroy masses of people, but only those who neglect the study, mastery and use of these measures."²

The question then broadens into one with psychological and political aspects and cannot be answered precisely or completely. Nevertheless we feel that our nation's civil-defense preparations may determine the balance of power in some future nuclear crisis. Civil defense is more important than ever at a time when other nations have extensive civil-defense plans and when the balance of terror that has reigned to date is being upset by the development of new types of weapons.

The protective measures against nuclear explosions and their effectiveness can be evaluated on the basis of a wealth of data gathered by the Atomic Energy Commission in its nuclear testing program. Besides making quantitative measurements of such phenomena as blast-wave pressures fallout intensity patterns and heat-ray intensities, the AEC constructed buildings and other structures in the vicinity of nuclear explosions and observed the resulting damage.³ This information has been used by the AEC (now ERDA) laboratories, Stanford Research

Institute, RAND Corporation, the Hudson Institute, the National Research Council and other institutions to devise and determine the effectiveness of methods for protecting people. Their results are in surprisingly close agreement.

Unfortunately the general public is not well informed about such studies, probably because a large fraction of the physics community as a whole is not aware of them. And yet so much physics is involved that physicists bear a responsibility to understand it themselves and to pass on the information through the classroom and other contacts. A clear presentation of the facts is essential because it is possible, as we shall see, that a nation's civil-defense preparedness may determine the balance of power in some future nuclear crisis.

The principal sources of danger and the most effective measures against them are listed in the table on this page. (Of course a far more convincing display of the data requires something like the elaborate descriptions in the USSR handbook.) Because of the short time available for action to protect against effects of nuclear weapons, survival depends very heavily on previous planning and preparation. The effectiveness of all the protective measures would be much increased if the population were familiar with them well before the attack. The stockpiling of relatively simple tools can also help in the long-term recovery effort. Because this subject is complicated and requires extensive considerations, we shall limit our discussion to the problems of survival of the initial effects of the attack that are listed in the table.

The most obvious way of protecting against all these effects is to prevent the bombs from exploding. For example, the U.S. might attack the enemy launch site before the missile leaves it. Such an attack is the purpose of the "smart bombs" bemoaned by Bernard T. Feld in the July 1975 issue of *Physics Today*. Or, the U.S. might destroy the incoming missile with its own missile—the Anti-Ballistic Missile. Despite extensive debate over the ABM, it cannot be generally implemented now. As a result of the SALT I treaty, the ABM is restricted, as far as nonmilitary defense is concerned, to Moscow (with a population of 4.5 million) and Washington, D.C. (population of 1.5 million). Nevertheless, even a small ABM system could be very effective. By destroying the first wave of incoming missiles, it can give time to the people to enter shelters or to protect themselves in other, although less effective ways.

Once a bomb does strike, the first effect is the electromagnetic pulse. This pulse threatens electric power transmission rather than human lives, although the disruption of radio transmission is of concern during an emergency.

The protection against the other effects of nuclear explosions can be provided in two ways—evacuation and shelter. Evacuation takes very much longer than the missile flight time and hence cannot be considered to be a truly defensive measure. If evacuation is undertaken during a crisis, it will greatly aggravate the situation. It can be effected before provoking a showdown and serve as an aggressive move. Hence, since the advent of missiles, our country did not seriously propose it until the elaborate evacuation preparations of the USSR became known. Now it is being seriously planned as a "counterevacuation," that is, as a response to a possible evacuation of the cities of the USSR. The Ponast study, which was organized by the National Security Council,⁴ considered a nuclear attack in which the USSR aimed two thirds of its destructive force at civilian targets. This attack would destroy 45% of the U.S. population under present circumstances. The preparation for the "counterevacuation" would cost about \$500

Footnotes at end of article.

million—one day's welfare expenditure—and would reduce the population loss to 11%. Because the USSR population is less crowded into cities than ours, their losses would be smaller yet—less than 5% according to our calculations.⁵ This loss is half of that experienced by the Soviets in World War II.

SHELTER DESIGN

The defense measure advocated in the U.S., and installed by the Chinese, is the provision of shelters. The technical problem is to design a shelter with maximum blast resistance, minimum access time and minimum cost. The Chinese appear to have conquered the problem. U.S. scientists, during a 1970 study at the Oak Ridge Civil Defense Project,⁶ estimated that effective shelters could be built at a cost of \$23 billion. In similar conclusions four years later, the Ponast study found that a \$35-billion investment—very much larger than that needed for preparation for counterevacuation and one tenth of one year's federal expenditures—would reduce the casualties caused by an attack by the USSR to 5.5%.⁷ For this reason we can not possibly accept Feld's conclusion in *Physics Today* that "there is no defense against nuclear weapons, now or in the foreseeable future." Actually, as we have just described, the effectiveness of shelters should not be surprising: If shelters were ineffective, the expenditure on their construction by the government of China, the government of a nation much poorer than ours, would be entirely unjustifiable.

A third intermediate arrangement for defense, also indicated already in the Soviet handbooks on civil defense,⁸ is to move most city dwellers away from densely populated areas but not as far as the pure counterevacuation proposes. Instead, the Soviets would build "expedient shelters" using materials at hand. Rather ingenious designs, which can be built by untrained prospective occupants, give a blast resistance of 30 pounds per square inch. Such a system, not significantly more expensive than the simple evacuation plan (not much over \$500 million, according to the Ponast study) could reduce the fatalities as well as does the elaborate and rather expensive shelter system referred to above. However neither one can provide protection against a sudden attack.

In the design of shelters, prompt nuclear radiation can generally be ignored in comparison with the blast wave unless the blast protection is very good or the weapon is very small. The reason is that prompt-radiation effects decrease much more rapidly with distance than do blast effects. To see this, note that the blast pressure in pounds per square inch from a W kiloton explosion at a distance r in kilometers is given approximately by

$$p = \frac{1.6 W^{2/3}}{r^2}$$

The intensity of the prompt radiation decreases more rapidly than $1/r^2$ because of the absorption by air. Thus, according to the equation, blast shelters designed for 100 psi will be effective against a 1-megaton weapon for distances greater than about $1\frac{1}{4}$ km. The area within which the pressure exceeds a given amount is inversely proportional to this pressure. Thus the area where the pressure exceeds 5 psi—the pressure often considered as a survival pressure for unprotected people—is twenty times the area for 100 psi.

The effects of blast decrease more rapidly with bomb yield than do those from prompt nuclear radiation. For very small nuclear weapons, prompt radiation can be more harmful than the blast. Thus for a 1-kiloton bomb, neutron and gamma radiation at 750 meters are 700 and 400 R if no protection is provided. The blast pressure at that distance

is 5 psi—quite tolerable. Indeed the mid-lethal blast pressure for a well instructed person, who knows how to protect himself from flying objects, is well in excess of 30 psi.

Blast shelters are designed not only to diminish the air pressure to which a person is subject, but also to protect him from flying objects. A properly designed blast shelter will also place sufficient mass between a person and the outside fallout particles to shield him adequately from the radiation. One foot of earth cover reduces radiation perpendicular to it by a factor around ten, and more than that for slanting rays. Shelters also provide cover against heat radiation and external fires. Two feet of earth will provide adequate protection from activity burning fire.

GLOBAL CONSEQUENCES

Worldwide effects from the detonation of a nuclear explosion naturally demand as much concern as the immediate effects. Many wonder whether the global consequences such as fallout might not be so severe as to deter any nation from even precipitating an attack. The most recent investigation of this question, the Nier report by the National Academy of Sciences,⁹ verified previous conclusions that world-wide fallout produced in a nuclear attack would not be sufficient to deter the attack. It found, however, that the depletion of the ozone layer could be more serious. Increased radiation might force people to adopt special protection against sunburn, and it would lead to an increase in the skin-cancer rate by a factor of almost two. The depletion of ozone would also upset some ecological systems in important ways. Although this study calls for additional research to answer some remaining questions regarding world-wide effects, Philip Handler, President of the National Academy, makes the following statement in his letter accompanying the Nier report:

"At the same time, the governments of the United States and of other major nuclear powers should be alert to the possibility that a geographically distant, populous other nation might determine that the degree of short-term damage to itself in this report, would be 'acceptable' and that, since long-term recovery would be highly likely, might conclude that its own self-interest is compatible with a major nuclear exchange between other powers."

In other words, we cannot count on global effects in themselves as deterrents.

Even though civil-defense measures can be effective as population protection, the US lags behind many nations of the world in building such systems. The Chinese have installed extensive blast shelter systems; the Russians have preferred an evacuation procedure that removes the city population to outlying areas where hasty shelters are to be constructed from materials at hand. Admittedly, this system would lose effectiveness if another nation initiated the war: It takes two or three days to evacuate cities and to build emergency shelters. However, if such time is available, the USSR system is cheaper and probably more effective than the Chinese blast shelters. The Chinese, however, can occupy their shelters in a very short time and thus be prepared for an attack with very little warning. Evidently the Chinese are afraid that someone will attack them with little notice, while the Russians believe that they are in a position to determine when the nuclear exchange will come and that they can carry out their evacuation and construction in time.

POLITICAL ASPECTS

The United States, on the other hand, has essentially no civil-defense system. This lack is deliberate, and the reasoning behind it is clearly evident in the hearings before Congress on military matters.¹⁰ Our leaders recognize that, if the nuclear powers have

the capability of destroying the opposing nuclear attack forces, they will be tempted to strike first. If they wait, their own weapons may be destroyed first and they would be defenseless. Thus the US, until quite recently, carefully designed its nuclear strike force to be effective against the population of an opponent but ineffective against his weapons. We also did not protect our people. This inaction assured him that we would not attack first and therefore, that he need not strike a preventive blow.

The trouble with our strategy was that the Soviets, and more recently the Chinese, have not accepted this "balance of terror." The Soviet's large missiles are effective against our land-based missiles and their killer submarines can attack our Polaris submarines. In addition, our population is so exposed that it is doubtful we would accept the casualties required to participate in any stage of nuclear war through a second, third, or any strike with our missiles. Perhaps such considerations led Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger to propose the addition to our arsenal of missiles that would be effective against sheltered enemy ICBM's.¹¹ However we are disappointed that Washington has not given strong support for measures that will protect the US population from the effects of a nuclear war.

As a final remark we wish to add that it disturbs us greatly that passionate opponents of the protection of our own civilians against nuclear attack do not oppose, and do not even mention, the elaborate preparations of the USSR in this direction. The Soviet handbook on civil defense is circulated in millions of copies. (It has been carefully studied at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.) The USSR gives instruction on civil defense in the high schools, they carry out exercises in their factories and, most distressingly, they have made elaborate preparation to evacuate their cities preceding a confrontation. If the opponents of the civil defense feel that these preparations are not even worth mentioning, why do they consider the protection of our own civilians objectionable and even provocative?

H-BOMB MAJOR IMMEDIATE EFFECTS

ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE

Expanding charged particles from bomb explosion.

Damage to electronic equipment up to hundreds of miles; power stations at shorter ranges.

Special protective equipment related to lightning security devices; no effects on humans.

PROMPT NUCLEAR RADIATION

Nuclear reactions during bomb explosion. Normally less than blast.

(Normally negligible compared to blast.)

HEAT RADIATION

Radiation from the hot fireball generated by the explosion.

Fires ignited a few tens of miles but greatly reduced by clouds or smog and dampness.

Eliminating exposed inflammable material; shelters including large public buildings.

BLAST WAVE

Expansion of hot bomb material pushes air into a wave of wind and high pressure.

Destruction of buildings as well as serious injuries to people from flying objects and falling buildings from five to ten miles.

Evacuation blast shelters; reinforced public buildings.

FALLOUT

Radioactive products of nuclear fission mixed with vaporized earth.

Heavily wind dependent; can be the order of one hundred miles.

Sheltering by large public buildings or special shelters for a few days or weeks until the radiation level has died down.

Footnotes at end of article.

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Civil Defense, a Report to the Atomic Energy Commission by a Committee of the National Academy of Sciences*, Washington, D.C., 1968. Available as TID-24690 from Division of Technical Information Extension, ERDA, P.O. Box 62, Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830; T. L. Martin, D. C. Latham, *Strategy for Survival*, University of Arizona Press, Tucson (1963); C. M. Haaland, *Systems Analysis of US Civil Defense Via National Blast Shelter Systems*, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Report ORNL-TM-2457 (1970).

² *Civil Defense*, (N. I. Akimov, ed.), Moscow, 1969. Translated by S. J. Rimshaw, ORNL-tr-2306 (1971).

³ S. Glasstone, *The Effects of Nuclear Weapons* (revised edition), US Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. (1974).

⁴ R. H. Sandwina, "Fonast II," *Proceedings of the Radiological Defense Officers Conference*, South Lake Tahoe, 23-25 October 1974, State of California Governor's Office of Emergency Services.

⁵ E. P. Wigner, "The Myth of Assured Destruction," in *The Journal of Civil Defense (Survive)*, July-August 1970, P.O. Box 910 Starke, Florida.

⁶ D. L. Narver, Jr., D. T. Robbins, *Engineering and Cost Considerations for Tunnel Grid Blast Shelter Complex*, ORNL-tm-1183 (1965); D. T. Robbins, D. L. Narver, Jr., *Engineering Study for Tunnel Grid Blast Shelter Concept for Portion of City of Detroit, Michigan*, ORNL-tm-1223 (1975).

⁷ *Long-Term World Wide Effects of Multiple Nuclear-Weapons Detonations*, The National Research Council (Committee Chairman, Alfred O. C. Nier); The National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C. (1975).

⁸ *Analyses of Effects of Limited Nuclear Warfare*, prepared for the Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Organizations and Security Agreements, of the Committee on Foreign Relations, US Senate, September 1975.

⁹ Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organization and Disarmament Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, US Senate, Ninety-first Congress.

A 5-CENT CUP OF COFFEE

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, the good ole' days of penny candy and 25-cent movies are still very much alive in my Fourth Congressional District of Indiana, the heartland of America, as evidenced by a small, country pharmacy in Topeka, Ind. I want to inform my colleagues that at the counter in Turner's pharmacy, you can still buy a cup of excellent home-made real honest-to-goodness coffee for just 5 cents. Tom Turner admitted to me during my recent visit there that the pressures of inflation had forced him to contemplate doubling his price to 10 cents a cup. He explained, with tongue in cheek, that he did not want to add to the many pressures causing and contributing to our spiraling inflation, so he intends to hold out a while longer before increasing his coffee prices. I appreciate businessmen like Tom Turner who are making the low-cost "good ole' days" more than just a memory.

ON THE B-1 BOMBER DEBATE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that for some time now a strong debate has been underway over our country's national defense and the potential contribution to our national security of the B-1 bomber. Mr. Francis Hoeber, an expert on these matters and researchist at the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies, has made a fine contribution to this debate in an article in the August 22, Los Angeles Times. Mr. Hoeber says that the B-1 bomber makes a vital contribution to our Nation's national security and to peace in the world, and that without it the United States may not have, in the eyes of the Russians, a credible deterrent for much longer. It should be read by all Members, regardless of whether they are for or against the B-1.

The article follows:

B-1 DELAY COSTLY IN MONEY AND U.S. STRENGTH

(By Francis P. Hoeber)

The massive lobbying effort against the B-1 strategic bomber will resume this week as Congress ends its recess and a House-Senate conference committee prepares to take up the question. Led by the National Campaign to Stop the B-1, a coalition of 27 groups opposing various defense appropriations, the lobby wants Congress to delay funding the bomber until "the next President" can make that important decision.

Such a postponement would be expensive, even if the President decides promptly in February to order production of the first three planes (the first of 241 to be built over the next eight years). Three prototype B-1s already are flying, and contracts have been let for the three production models. Further delay, even for a few months, will cost an estimated \$500 million because existing subcontracts will have to be canceled and work forces disbanded, requiring new contracts, hiring and training if the program is resumed. Inflation in the meanwhile could make the figure larger.

Still, those who press for delay sound reasonable and temperate. The truth, however, is that they want the program delayed forever.

The basic argument of the anti-B-1 lobby is that the bomber represents overkill: We have more than enough missiles to destroy all the Soviet cities, and bombers would only come along later and "bounce the rubble," in Winston Churchill's vivid phrase. The missiles' potential for accomplishing the "assured destruction" of Soviet population and industry is seen as sufficient to make war impossible.

Assured destruction, however, never was an adequate concept of deterrence, and it is rapidly becoming infeasible because the Russians have implemented an aggressive war-fighting, war-winning, war-surviving doctrine. For example, a massive Soviet civil-defense effort, accelerated in the early 1970s, includes training the population for evacuation of cities, building shelters, dispersing industrial plants and making them blast-resistant. Making no secret of this program, they publish detailed "how to" manuals on civil defense. According to Russian claims, their losses from a U.S. mass attack would be only 5 to 8% of their urban population and essential production would continue.

Even if they do only half that well, we could still not achieve the level of assured destruction that has long been considered necessary to deter the Russians from attacking us: obliterating 20 to 25% of the population and 50 to 67% of their industrial capacity.

Meanwhile, the Russians are rapidly approaching strategic superiority. Taking full advantage of concessions they received under the SALT I interim agreement on offensive arms signed in 1972, they are building more and larger missiles. Three new Soviet ICBMs are larger and each is equipped with several individual nuclear warheads.

In addition to this, they are developing a "new generation" of ICBMs. The Russians have tested a land-mobile missile that can be moved around to evade our weapons. They are deploying a new 4,200-nautical mile submarine-launched missile on a new class of submarine (years before our 4,000-mile Trident 1 missile, which is still in development), and they are deploying a new supersonic bomber, the Backfire, capable of reaching the United States.

In the early 1980s they will have more strategic nuclear power than the United States and will be capable of partially disarming us while withholding enough forces to make it suicidal for us to retaliate.

This growth in Soviet capabilities makes it imperative that the United States take action to maintain its policy objectives of (1) "credible deterrence," meaning the Russians will be convinced we are as strong as we say we are; (2) "assured retaliation" against dispersed military, economic and political targets; (3) flexibility to respond to less than all-out threats or attacks; and (4) "equivalence"—that is, denying the Russians the advantage they would obtain militarily and psychologically if they achieved actual and apparent superiority.

Modernization of our bomber force is one of the keys to achieving these policy objectives:

Credible deterrence: Is it credible for us to threaten, when faced with Soviet provocation or attack, to push the button that irrevocably sends massive numbers of U.S. missiles to the Soviet Union? The Russians and many of our allies think not. Only the bomber offers the President a rational alternative that retains America's credibility. He can launch all or some of his bombers and keep them subject to recall, gaining several hours in which to negotiate. Because the bomber is recallable, its very slowness is a virtue.

Assured retaliation: Far from being able to merely "bounce the rubble," a manned bomber—with a pilot responsible for assessing the success of an attack and switching targets if necessary—could carry out the much more difficult task of seeking out the many dispersed targets which, if destroyed, would deny the Russians victory in war and survival as a superpower.

American ICBMs still may be able to do this job, but that may not be true much longer because they are becoming increasingly vulnerable. The new, large Soviet missiles are more accurate than our ICBMs and by the 1980s will be able to knock out many of our Minuteman and Titan missiles unless we "launch on warning"—that is, unless we fire our own missiles in fear of losing them by not using them.

Similarly, our submarine-launched missiles conceivably could do the job, but their warheads are both smaller and less accurate than those of either the ICBMs or our strategic bombers. Moreover, the Russians have increasing antisubmarine capability to sink our submarines—not all at once, perhaps, but certainly one at a time. Would we want to bomb Soviet cities—thus risking the loss of our own—all because they torpedoed a few U.S. submarines?

Beyond that, communications with submarines are inherently difficult: Only very large, low-frequency transmitters can reach subs beneath the water, and if the Russians were to knock these out, our subs would be beyond our control.

Flexible options: The bomber would also provide a special, flexible capability for limited attacks. Using bombers instead of missiles for early, small responses would create less psychological incentive for escalation.

Equivalence: Given the small size and number of U.S. missiles relative to the Russians, the bombers, with their large payloads, contribute immensely to both real and perceived equivalence.

For these reasons, it is important to continue to have an effective bomber component in our strategic forces. However, even if this point is granted, foes of the B-1 argue that it is the wrong bomber; in their view, cruise missiles are a better alternative since the B-1 is not the ultimate bomber and is too costly.

B-1 opponents propose that a cheaper, better substitute for the B-1 would be the new cruise missile, launched from outside the Soviet airspace from a wide-bodied aircraft like the Boeing 747. The problem is that the time required to design, test and produce both the longer-range cruise missiles and a new transport would mean that the system would not be ready until the late 1980s at best. We need new forces by the early to mid-80s; and the B-1 would be ready.

Moreover, there are serious doubts whether the cruise missile could perform all the necessary missions, whether the 747-type carrier would survive and whether the combined system would be cheaper, let alone as effective as the B-1.

Cruise missiles that can be built in the next eight to 12 years could not carry the "penetration aid" used by the B-1 to ensure that most of the bombers will get through Soviet defenses—for example, electronic devices to fool enemy radar and missiles. Nor does the cruise missile have the bomber's ability to perceive that a given target has already been hit and to select another target.

The United States is certain to lose equivalence in the early 1980s if we do not push on with existing plans while preparing new initiatives in both force modernization and arms control proposals. The only new systems we can deploy by that date are those now under way: not only the B-1 but also the Trident subs and their missiles.

The B-1 clearly is the best bomber for its purposes that can be built now. If we start over and develop a new strategic bomber—even one that takes advantage of new technological developments—we might come up with a bomber for the 1990s, but our delay would assure the Russians reaching superiority in the preceding decade.

In any event, we are told that the B-1 "would be the most expensive weapons system in history" and would be a drag on the economy. The opposite is true: production would stimulate the economy, but that is not the reason we need the B-1. Furthermore, the \$92 billion figure for 244 B-1s which has been bandied about is blown up by a series of accounting tricks. It includes 30 years of operating costs; it includes predictions of inflation; it includes new tankers which will be built for other purposes and at most shared by the B-1, and it includes improved weapons that will be built for the B-52 if there is no B-1.

In reality, the 244 B-1s will cost about \$1 billion a year in 1976 dollars, if they are used for 30 years, or 1% of the defense budget—far less than the amount that has customarily been allocated to strategic bombers.

At this reasonable cost, the B-1 has a far better chance to maintain our capability for assured retaliation and flexible options against improving Soviet air defenses than

the far less capable B-52, which would require an estimated \$40 million per plane—three-quarters of the cost of a B-1—for modernization and rebuilding so that it could keep flying for one-half the life of the B-1.

For all these reasons, Congress should decide to get on with B-1 production—not because the Air Force pilots want it, not because it would provide jobs, but because it is a plane that can do what is required in time to help meet the mushrooming Soviet threat and to help provide the essential strength from which the United States can try to negotiate acceptable arms-control agreements.

TRIBUTE TO THE HARD-WORKING PEOPLE OF THE THEATER

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, in this Bicentennial Year as we acknowledge and remember our vast resources, I believe it fitting to pay tribute to the dedicated and hard-working people of the theater—particularly the volunteers throughout the land—who with their many talents have contributed so much to the enjoyment and richness of lives.

There is an all-volunteer theatrical group in my congressional district in Chicago—the Old Town Players, 1718 N. North Park—who are most worthy of special attention. This theater company is now in its 44th season—its 10th in Chicago's Old Town.

On September 10, this remarkable group will stage its 1,000th performance at its present location with a spirited production of Moss Hart's "Light Up the Sky." As of midsummer, this group had played to an audience well over 68,000 persons, all in the 98-seat lovely and historic St. James Church.

In their 44 years, the Old Town Players have earned an outstanding reputation throughout the country. Drama critics have been lavish in praising both the players and their hard-working director, Frank Carioti. In a recent review of the Old Town Players' production of "After the Rain," the Chicago Sun-Times declared:

... Carioti is obviously a meticulous craftsman when it comes to technique. The pace, the lighting and the sound effects are remarkably expert. And few would know that it is all done on a shoestring and a big box of tinfoil. Here is a production that has been prepared with a great deal of care and ingenuity and there is not one player ill-suited to his role.

Not only has this group made theatrical history in Chicago, it has also succeeded in getting Chicago's municipal code revised so that its tiny auditorium could be rezoned for theatrical use. When city officials threatened to close down their theater, the Old Town Players rallied support from the Old Town Triangle community which had enthusiastically welcomed the actors and their patrons. Together they enlisted the aid of Mayor Daley and soon a new code for not-for-profit theaters was enacted by the city council. They now hold the first license

to be issued by the city of Chicago as a theatrical community center.

We, in the Ninth District of Illinois are proud of the contributions and achievements of the Old Town Players.

THE SMITHSONIAN'S S. DILLON RIPLEY, ON THE MEANING AND EFFECTIVE USE OF MUSEUMS

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress have a tremendous amount of required reading to do.

We read in the office, and we read at home. We also read on planes and at airports.

It is my habit to put aside magazine articles, speeches, and other matters of interest for my "airplane reading" file, and this file invariably becomes quite bulky.

So it was that on a recent flight from Detroit to Washington I finally had a chance to read a very perceptive and interesting speech delivered some time ago by S. Dillon Ripley, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

I was favorably impressed with Mr. Ripley's remarks and regard them as timely and appropriate reading for a wider audience.

Accordingly, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, Mr. Ripley's Memorial Day 1976 speech is set forth below:

SPEECH BY S. DILLON RIPLEY

(The text of a speech prepared by S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, for delivery at the opening session of the 71st Annual Meeting of the American Association of Museums, Monday, May 31, at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C.)

Here in the Bicentennial year, I am minded of the happy events of eleven years ago when I had first come to the Smithsonian and when I had an opportunity to address the delegates to the Bicentennial celebration of James Smithson's birth, as well as the world meeting, here and in New York City, of the International Council of Museums. Now as indeed I said then, we all perceive one central truth: "Museums and their activities are playing a larger and larger part every day in our cultural scene, and yet the purposes for which they exist and the meaning of museums still manages to elude the public and the world of affairs." Why is it that museums even today find themselves viewed as so largely out of the main stream, the real world?

It seems to me that there are two main reasons, one to do with education, the other connected with the assumptions of our adult life. The world of education is in a terrible dilemma today, the certitude and self-righteousness of past years replaced by self-doubt over falling standards, diminishing numbers of young students and incredible inflationary pressures. Throughout our whole history in the United States we have been dedicated to the goal of education for everyone, an inalienable right of freedom. But in the new land of freedom where this had been achieved by uniting and by forging together a democratic society, life itself had a solemn responsibility to the state, to the family, to

other citizens; and to the community. It was in this context that every citizen deserved the best in training and discipline of the mind which a real education could produce.

In order to achieve this demonstrable goal, a century or more of increasing support for education from state and federal sources, gradually replacing, especially recently, much of the earlier highly-motivated private or religious philanthropy, has produced a massive series of formulas for education. The complex web of paternalistic regulations and accreditations has achieved an immense infrastructure of competitive yet complacent institutions providing careers to a welter of bureaucrats and teachers to teach teachers. All of this is assumed to refine skills—learning and the transfer of training as life goals rather than the acquisition of knowledge or the creation of patterns of discipline of the mind.

In this juggernaut car ponderously careening down main street, museums still have no defined role. As latecomers on the scene we continue to be decorations, frills or ornaments, and as such viewed as potentially dispensable in a time of fiscal crunch.

In eleven years I have not seen a rush by any major segment of the educational establishment to clasp museums to its bosom. In special areas of conservation and art history, yes to a limited extent. In Anthropology a toe in the door perhaps under the rubric of the social sciences. In the natural sciences suspicion of organismic biology coupled with prejudice over environment and economic confrontations continues to produce bias in thought and deed.

And yet there are beginning to be cracks in the monolithic facade of assumptions. Education is a vast ecclesiastical structure. Like some of our most established churches the ravelled sleeves and hems are showing. In the past decade there has been a marked increase of school participation in museum experiences, at the early school level, and training at graduate levels, an interplay in course structure and job and career training in museum careers. Will this be added to? As I see it yes in several ways. Education itself has declined overall in quality. This is partly due to its very massiveness, its ponderous rules, its denial of individuality through rote teaching, as well as succumbing to the new luxurious modes of thought of the sixties, the mindless drive towards self-fulfillment, which so often merely masks a lack of discipline and loss of faith. With this has come the eerie after-effect of nearly a generation of watching television, the conduit for cultural values in the American home, as Eric Barnouw has described it, displacing Grandpa, Grandma, school and church.

I have been interested recently to read in the papers that the *Soap Opera Digest*, chronicling the day-to-day loves and hates and dreams of all the 14 daytime dramas, is the fastest growing magazine in the country. As the slogan goes, "These are the women you want to reach . . . the women who load up their shopping carts weekly with soaps and cereals . . . beauty and health products . . . paper and sanitary goods . . . baby and pet foods . . ." Truly the medium has become the message.

But why do I dwell so much on education and its present problems? Obviously because I do not believe museums have anything to gain in the long run without allying themselves somehow with the destinies of education in this country.

But how shall we order our lives to achieve this result? We must begin to learn how to make more effective educational use of the several thousand museums that exist in the United States. They represent virtually untapped resources within the academic community, and one would hope that the educational establishment would explore how best to integrate the assets of mu-

seums—their curators, their collections, their research and their physical environment—into the teaching mosaic. In recent years American museums largely on their own have dramatically widened the range and increased the extent of their educational activities. Museums are a community educational resource; they represent human capital. Museums are sylvan sacred groves in which the fruits of the human condition are seen at their finest and preserved for future generations, waiting to teach the past, and expose presentiments for the future.

All of us in museum work believe this and yet often we are skeptical of the possibilities. With the lower grades yes; the "Discovery Rooms" of sight, feel and touch are marvelous for children; with the graduate students by all means; we are comfortable with teaching at that level and with the hope of replicating our own professional competence. But at the college level we continue in the main to fail to interact between museums and college course curricula. I noted this in my book, *The Sacred Grove*, that college courses are too tunnel-like, careers and the pressure competitive track systems too acute for museum work to manage to capture the interest of most teachers and students in the constant race for time and minimal attention span.

It is not for lack of trying. The Smithsonian's National Museum Act has sought to improve museum techniques and provide training and the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities have been most effective life-savers, not only for individuals as sources of research and performance grants, but to a significant extent for museums as institutions. However, the report *Museums and Education* (1968), which called for a research and development program for museum education, generated no action in the major government department (Health, Education and Welfare) concerned.

Museums can be only a small part of the programs of the endowments because of the competition with the performing and plastic arts, folklife and other interests. Nonetheless, a start has been made in the current reauthorization bill for the endowments in the new title establishing an institute for the improvement of museum services in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, providing for a program of grants for rehabilitation and construction of museum facilities and operating expenses. Whether the institute will rest with the endowments or in HEW is still subject to debate. From a practical political point of view, the large sums of money authorized would seem modest when swallowed in the cavernous recesses of the budget of HEW, the largest department of government in fiscal terms. As such a sum of forty million dollars could be far more vulnerable as well as visible in the smaller budgets of the endowments. And in an election year, as the diminished bird song in Washington's Spring season reminds us, fiscal austerity is the watchword.

As museums come closer to success in establishing a precedent for government funding for services and for services rendered, akin to the massive support for colleges and schools, it would be wise to look ahead and consider that with federal funding come certain reciprocals: oversight, control, bureaucratic management, accountability, and increased administrative and overhead responsibilities. All governments and other very large granting bodies require this today.

I would urge one and all to recall that the education apparatus in this country now suffers to an extent from vast federal support. The prescription of policies stem from the spending power. Money begets power, but the ultimate power rests with the dispensers of the money. Vast money produces

regimentation and pedantry. Museums would do well to measure thus their independence against their eventual dependence on government funds.

Turning from education to public exposure, there is no doubt that television, the most promising of the new techniques of exposing an object, talking about it, and increasing the appeal of the museum experience, continues to be a failure. In eleven years I have yet to see adequate use made of museum collections in this medium. The one program which spoke to me, and to the public, "What in the World," put on by the University Museum of Pennsylvania as a brilliant exposition of Art and Ethnography, flopped for lack of a sponsor. At least two great series done by the BBC, Clark's "Civilization" and Bronowski's "Ascent of Man," were narrated by geniuses, and utterly successful, saved only at the last moment, over the objections of the major networks, embedded as they have been in the rituals of soap opera and other bread and circuses for the masses, designed not to interfere with the ads.

Now at last public television may come of age, and save us all, citizens and museums alike, from the numbing conformity meted out by the tube. To counter this and restore the use of language to its rightful place, I have recently recommended, at the level of basic training in writing and literate skills, that we use television, the erstwhile enemy, to develop new programs in training. Here on the screen we could associate words beautifully with objects exhibited, a museum-like technique, but performed the way Mme. Montessori showed us a year ago, so that we reinforce the learning process in a way that children have always responded to—with touch, sight and a deeper perception. Perhaps in this way, museums could find a firmer, a more committed involvement with the new media techniques and in the process produce our new open university. Somewhere out there, in the museum world, someone is waiting to pull it off!

I have not mentioned the slow but promising growth of corporate support for museums. This is a welcome nascent phenomenon, often hindered in its progress by the impersonality and restlessness of corporations themselves. Here leaders alone count, men and women able to attach ultimate values of environmental health of their employees to the urban surroundings in which these employees live. But executive rotation and impersonal management are a hindrance to real corporate responsibility, and every effort should be made to encourage a continuing dialogue between museum and corporate management.

As we all know, I think museums do possess some of the ultimate weapons for the future. As possibly the last legitimate growth industry, museums will continue over the years to amass more of the world's artifacts, those made by the hand of God as well as those made by man.

They thus are the eventual repositories of the truths of conservation, the testament of history, and the measure of the sustainable degradation of our planet. Here is a weapon for the future, the roster and the tally of the grains of matter slowly disappearing before our eyes. Museums thus have a moral responsibility to preserve these objects with newly refined skills, and on the part of the Smithsonian Institution I can testify to our desire to serve as a leader in the field of conservation, but also the right to point out, as in a kind of world Farmer's Almanac, how much more, how long and for what purposes we the people can continue to sully our planetary nest.

And so as the Spring goes and the bird songs diminish, I can testify to one thing as I have before: Over this world of ours winds of change are blowing. From whence they

come and whither they go no man knows. Only the rate may be measured in finite terms, the rate, the time change. No people are better trained to ring the changes of this relentless progression than those who do their research in museum laboratories. To develop and foster such research is one of the most important goals in the world today.

KEYS' TESTIMONY SUPPORTS INCREASED LAW ENFORCEMENT SERVICES AT CORPS OF ENGINEERS WATER RESOURCES PROJECTS

HON. MARTHA KEYS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mrs. KEYS. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Water Resources of the House Public Works and Transportation Committee is holding hearings on the Water Resources Development Act of 1976. One of the proposals being discussed for possible inclusion in this act is a bill which I introduced, H.R. 14005. This legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Army to contract with States and their political subdivisions for the purpose of obtaining increased law enforcement services at water resources development projects under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army. Today, I testified before the subcommittee in support of this legislation. My remarks follow:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE MARTHA KEYS

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before the Members of the House Subcommittee on Water Resources to express my strong support for legislation introduced by me regarding law enforcement aid to areas with Federal reservoirs. My proposal is to authorize the Corps of Engineers to contract with States and their political subdivisions for increased law enforcement services at water resources development projects under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army. There is a strong need for this type of legislation and it is my hope that it can be included in the Water Resources Development Act of 1976 which you are now considering.

In Northeastern Kansas, attendance at Corps of Engineer reservoirs continues to climb. Visitors to Milford, Tuttle Creek, Pomona, and Perry Lake total more than 6 million during the summer months, nearly three times the entire population of the State of Kansas. The strain on local law enforcement officials and their capacity to respond to emergency situations created by this influx of people outstrips what the local taxpayers can provide. The millions of people enjoying the recreational facilities at these lakes are left with little recourse in seeking help. This bill would authorize funds to be appropriated as necessary to insure continued enjoyment by visitors at lakes and to help with the growing problem of crime and the need for help to local officials.

At the beginning of this summer, over the Memorial Day weekend when I was in the Second District, I stopped by the Tuttle Creek Reservoir and visited with Mr. Willis Penhollow, Director of the Riley County, Kansas, Police Department. We talked about law enforcement needs at Federal recreational area projects such as Tuttle Creek. Because of a lack of additional funds, it takes an ingenious sheriff or director to juggle personnel schedules and responsibilities to be able to respond to emergency calls and/or law enforcement problems and to cover all bases

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

adequately. Fortunately, no really serious problems have developed in any of the reservoirs in the Second District and surrounding areas. It is a great credit to the personnel in those areas and their efforts in making their limited funds and staff reach the areas of need. In recognition, however, of the increasing numbers of people using these facilities and the demands on local officials, legislation such as H.R. 14005 which I introduced to provide additional personnel and funds as necessary to meet the increased demands for additional law enforcement personnel at Corps of Engineers projects is seriously needed. In talking with him on Memorial Day, Mr. Penhollow said such funding would allow him to stabilize his operations in Riley County.

Jefferson County Sheriff Carl Eisenhower of Lake Perry has also worked with my office in support of this legislation. I would like to use Lake Perry, one of the reservoirs in my area, as an example to illustrate the magnitude of this problem.

Jefferson County has a population of 10 to 12 thousand and Lake Perry is entirely within this county. The lake encompasses 159 miles of shoreline, 39,338 acres of fee lands, and 12,200 acres of water. During the months of April through October, more than 1.5 million people visit this recreational area—people with motor boats, sail boats, campers, Boy Scout hikers, bicyclists, swimmers, and picnickers. Sheriff Eisenhower has a five-man force each of whom are presently working an 80-hour week at a salary of approximately \$675 per month. The local county government has no additional sources of revenue to support either greater salaries or more personnel.

Despite this increased number of man-hours and work schedule, over-all crime in the county increases 150 percent during peak-use periods. Theft alone increases more than 300 percent. Crimes of a less violent nature often go unreported. The Sheriff's department details two men to assist in dredging and land support operations when a drowning occurs who are on duty until the body is located. On several occasions, this period of time has stretched into two and three days. With such a small staff, you can see that their ability to respond to emergency calls relating to water accidents or other personal medical emergencies is severely strained.

As you already know, both the Office of Management and Budget and the Department of the Army have recommended that this legislation be favorably considered. In addition, the report of the Secretary of the Army to the Congress on visitor protection service at Corps of Engineers lakes, dated December 1974, indicated that a reasonably significant level of criminal activity exists at a majority of Corps lakes. The report also states that criminal activity, or the threat of it, results in a significant and unquantifiable diminution of the value of the recreation experience of the visitor.

Thus, I believe that passage of the legislation I have introduced will provide the needed assistance to local law enforcement officials so that they will be better equipped to provide additional visitor protection services at peak-use times at Corps of Engineers lakes in the Second District of Kansas and throughout the United States.

TWO HUNDRED YEARS AGO TODAY

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago, on August 30, 1776, in an effort to expedite the communication of intelli-

August 31, 1976

gence throughout the colonies, the Continental Congress resolved:

That . . . there should be employed on the several post roads, a rider for every twenty five or thirty miles, whose business it shall be, to proceed through his stage three times in every week, setting out immediately on the receipt of the mail, and travelling with the same, by night and by day, without stopping, until he shall have delivered it to the next rider; and that the post master general be desired, either by the use of way bills, or by such other means as he shall find most efficacious, to prevent delays in the riders, or to discover where they happen, that such dilatory riders may be discharged.

LETTER WRITING CAMPAIGN

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 31, 1976

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, in the last week or so many Members have been inundated with mail calling on Congress to vote money for the B-1 bomber program. As Members of the Congress we need to hear from our constituents or we cannot do our job. But some things about this latest letter-writing campaign have disturbed me. First, employees of Rockwell International Corp., the prime contractor for the B-1, have been prompted—perhaps ever pressured—to write these letters. Second, from the mail I have received it is apparent that many employees who have nothing to do with the B-1 program have been misled into believing their jobs may depend on the B-1 program.

Let me quote from a few letters I have received to illustrate the corporate pressure behind this mail:

From a constituent in Beloit, Wis.:

I support the bomber project, OK, OK. I'm really a player just working for Rockwell and they told me to write something.

From a constituent in Fontana:

I have been asked by the company I work for to write to you about the B1 bomber project and I would like you to know that I am not for the B1 at this time, and I doubt if I will change my mind.

And from another constituent in Beloit:

This letter is being written on Rockwell Inter. time, dealing with the B1 bomber. I am against it and since Rockwell is paying me to write this letter and send it here it is.

About 90 percent of the mail I have received came with the same "E Pluribus Unum" postage stamp while the remainder came with the same Harvard, Ill., postage meter. A member of my staff reached an executive at the Harvard Admiral plant, which is wholly owned by Rockwell. The executive confirmed that the company, at the behest of the parent firm, gave its employees paper, envelopes, stamps and time for the purpose of writing their Congressmen.

The Harvard plant makes television products—exclusively. It has nothing remotely to do with the B-1 bomber. Yet a number of employees were clearly induced to write out of concern that their jobs would be at stake if the Congress

did not give Rockwell all it wanted for the B-1.

For example, a constituent from Delavan, Wis., wrote:

I am in full support of the B1 bomber project for our protection and our jobs.

Another wrote:

I fully support the B1 bomber project and strongly urge you to vote [in] favor of it. Sincerely (need a job) . . .

A woman from Williams Bay wrote:

What's this nonsense about the downfall of the B-1 bomber?

I am in favor of the project. Evidently there will be a war in the near future. Why should our country be behind the others? Besides, I work for Rockwell International and the bomber project could mean saving my job. As scarce as jobs are now I sure don't want to lose mine. . . .

A gentleman from Beloit, Wis., showed concern for his job—but also a certain skepticism that his job was really involved:

I'm in favor, IF we are promised twelve months a year & a 40 hour week. We don't need a six month lay off or trips to Mars & outer space. If otherwise, I'm NOT in favor.

Another wrote very succinctly and to the point:

Please see to it that Admiral Rockwell works good this year.

The bulk of the mail, of course, supported the B-1 program. More than one-third of all the mail I personally received contained the same one-word sentence of support:

I fully support the B-1 bomber project and strongly urge you to vote in favor of it.

One woman was such an enthusiastic supporter that she sent three letters, with the same name and return address, but using a slightly different handwriting each time.

We here in Congress want to hear from our constituents and need to hear from them if we are to do our job. But letterwriting campaigns run by corporations who twist the arms of their employees by wrongfully implying their jobs are on the line are a perversion of the democratic process.

In fact, Wisconsinites who were deluded into believing support for the B-1 meant support for their jobs were actually supporting a tax loss for themselves. In the years from 1970 to 1985 Wisconsinites will be taxed to the tune of \$469 million to finance the B-1, according to calculations made by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SEIBERLING), but Wisconsin firms will get only \$60 million in B-1 contracts.

Thus the Harvard plant employees, whose employment depends not on the B-1 but on the television market, are being asked to lobby Congress—not to save their jobs, but to support a tax drain amounting to \$240 for each and every Wisconsin taxpayer. When the company asked these people to write Congress, I will bet they never explained that to them.

There is one other issue here that disturbs me. Rockwell saw to it that the

employees did their lobbying with company stamps, paper and time. Since the Harvard plant was not doing Government work, that appears to be within the firm's legal right. But many of Rockwell's 120,000 employees around the country work exclusively on Government projects. If they were told to lobby on company time, it appears that the Government was, in effect, paying to have itself lobbied, which would appear to be a violation of the law. I have asked the Secretary of Defense to investigate and determine if any of the direct and/or indirect costs of the Rockwell lobbying campaign were in any way passed on to the U.S. Government.

In conclusion, I would like to share with you three other letters I received in the Rockwell mass mailing. One gentleman wrote:

Let's get a bunch of the B1s built before the Ruskis' Backfires get us.

While a woman wrote:

I do not strongly support this B1 bomber project. I feel it is a great disaster to our nation and also Rockwell corporation throughout the nation. All employees should feel the same way, because if not they are insane.

And finally one unsigned letter has me scratching my head. Addressed "Dear Honorable Lee A Spine", it said:

I full Suppose the B1 Bomp. that you Have vote in Favarity of. Because I feel like it would be wathl your while to give it a change and well the company and the people belive it So I Hope you will give it a charge. See what ary why. and you Decides what?

SENATE—Wednesday, September 1, 1976

(Legislative day of Friday, August 27, 1976)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who makest the light to shine out of darkness, we thank Thee for the light of this new day. Grant that we may welcome its opportunities, waste none of its precious hours and fail in none of its duties. Give us poise and patience and power. Spare us from impatience, from being touchy, quick to take offense and slow to forget it. Grant to us something of the manliness of the Master. Teach us again the dignity of all work when done in Thy name, and especially the high trust of work in this place. At the end grant us the gift of rest and the miracle of a renewed mind and body.

We pray in the name of the Great Carpenter, who went about doing good. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

CXXII—1811—Part 22

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D.C., September 1, 1976.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LEAHY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, August 31, 1976, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations under "New Reports."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of William G. Bradford, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chad.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert J. McCloskey, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about Ambassador McCloskey, who has performed superbly as the congressional liaison chief between the Department of State and Congress. In that capacity, he had the title of Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Affairs.

Mr. McCloskey used to be the chief press officer for the Department of State before he became Ambassador to Cyprus, and when the present Secretary of State, Dr. Henry Kissinger, was appointed to his present position, he recalled Ambassador McCloskey from Cyprus to take over his very responsible position in establishing a relationship between Congress and the Department of State.

He is indeed an extraordinary man,